

Continues The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrations

Rev. M. M. Kilpatrick #20
469 S. 2nd St.,
San Jose, Calif.
8)

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., William H. Bates, D.D.
Leander S. Keyser, D.D. David S. Kennedy, D.D.

Contributing Editors—W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., William Phillips Hall, H. W. Bromley, M.A., D.D.,
Edwin W. Caswell, D.D., A. William Lewis, A.B., B.D., Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D.,
John L. Dickens, D.D., LL.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D. Charles Calvert Ellis, B.D., Ph.D.,
William Harrison, D.D., Bishop William F. Heil, D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

Bates-Fosdick—Who's Who in Evolution—More proofs on the Right Side—Pertinences from Patton—Did Civilization Evolve from Barbarism—Notes and Comments 61-81

THE ARENA

The Riddle of Spiritism—Is Orthodoxy afraid of Scholarship?—The greatest thing that Is—Science and Immortality—The Epistles to the Corinthians—William Cowper 82-106

THE CLUB

Abraham Lincoln—Looking into Jesus—A Test for Critical Scholarship—Believing in the Deity of Christ—A Bible statement of Faith 107-111

THE SANCTUARY

Christian Growth 112-115

FLASHLIGHTS

116-118

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

Christ All in All—The Mind of Christ—The Prince of the Host of Jehovah—A Magic Wand 119-120

FRANK J. BOYER, PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price \$2.00 the Year Canada \$2.25, Foreign \$2.35 Single Copy 20 Cents

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Formerly the American Bible League

An Organization formed to promote a true knowledge of
the Bible and consequent faith in its Divine Authority.

William Phillips Hall, President

Frank J. Boyer, Secretary-Treasurer

Important Instructions: All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Change in Address—It is very important that Old as well as New address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expirations and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

CHURCH FURNITURE

Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book Racks, Tables, Desks—EVERYTHING. The finest furniture made. Direct from our factory to your church. Catalog free.

DeMoulin Bros. & Co., Dept. 79, Greenville, Ill.



Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price.....50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D. D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price.....50c

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corns, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price.....50c

"It deserves its name. Open it anywhere, and you will drop on an ingenious arrangement of a subject, a happily selected cluster of Scripture texts, or illustrations for lighting up an address."
—Rev. F. B. Meyer.

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price.....50c

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invaluable to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

Frank J. Boyer, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

You Can't Improve

The old historic method for bringing blessing to the households of faith that the family altar has always represented. Everywhere souls are hungry for the spiritual vitamins that shall give to the soul the health that means holiness. Intellectual husks aren't satisfying.

No revival of pentecostal fervor will ever come to the church until it shall begin at the family altar. A new day will come in religious achievement when age and sex have their spiritual needs met in the holy atmosphere that a household of faith alone can produce.

Modern conditions demand an adaptation of pastoral service to meet the problem of maintaining a family religious life. Many ministers are searching out ways of satisfying these needs of the Christian home.

Send 10c for the postage on a sample packet of literature, including a free copy of "The Christian Home Magazine" and a booklet "A Suggested Program for a Family Altar Day."

Address

THE FAMILY ALTAR LEAGUE

541 Marquette Bldg.

Chicago, Illinois

Rev. W. E. Biederwolf, President.

Rev. Wm. Matthew Holderby, Gen. Sec.

Bound Volumes and Orthodox Pamphlets

Nothing offered on this page can be duplicated after stock now on hand is exhausted. We are closing out this lot at HALF and LESS THAN HALF ACTUAL VALUE. Everything offered here sent Prepaid

Collapse of Evolution, by Dr. L. T. Townsend

The new and enlarged edition is now ready to mail. It is a beautifully printed pamphlet, with bright, strong, cover, 64 pages. Orders for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the press. Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—and order a lot to give to your friends.

Price 20c each; \$2.25 per dozen; \$17.00 per 100. Always sent prepaid in whatever quantities.

Look this List over---Order at once---All sent prepaid

Constructive Studies in Matthew, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for	\$2.50
Constructive Studies in John, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for	2.50
(NOTE—West of Mississippi River price for above 2 pamphlets is 40c ea; or \$3.00 per doz.)	
Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton, 20c Pocket edition, now 15c each, or dozen for	1.50
Higher Criticism: A Present Appraisal, 10c each, per dozen75
From Pulpit to Poor House, Dr. Hamilton, \$1.00 cloth edition, now60
Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures, Dr. Hamilton, 10c edition, now 6c ea. doz.50
Editor in the Pulpit, Dr. Hamilton, 5c edition, now 4c each, or dozen for40
Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout, 10c edition, 10c each, or dozen for75
Essays on Miracles and Studies in Theology, by Judge Lamb, 5c each, or dozen for40
Biblical Giving, Smith, 5c each, or per dozen50

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer

\$1.75 each for years as fol.:

1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916:

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer

\$2.25 each for years as fol.:

1917, 1918.

Have nearly every number Sermonizer from 1910 to 1918, single numbers, which we will supply at 10c each. Ministers will find these numbers very valuable for pulpit preparation, as they contain only Homiletic helps—Sermons, Outlines of Sermons, and other Homiletic literature.

Cloth Bound Books by Dr. Townsend

Published to sell at \$1.00, \$1.25, \$1.50

Your choice at 50c—3 books for \$1.25

God-Man—Search and Manifestation

Sword and Garment

The Arena and the Throne

Cloth Bound Vols. Bible Champion

\$2.75 each for volumes as fol.:

Volume VIII—January to June, 1908
IX—July to December, 1908
X—January to June, 1909
XII—January to June, 1910
XIII—July to December, 1910
XIV—January, 1911 to April, 1912
XXIV—January to December, 1918
XXV—January to December, 1919
XXVI—January to December, 1920
XXVIII—January to December, 1922
XXVII—January to December, 1921

Single numbers Champion, any number previous to July, 1918, at 5c each, to close out. Any number from July, 1918 to date, at 10c each. Please note that we cannot supply numbers for full years for any year previous to July, 1918, but can supply any number, at this time, from July, 1918, to date.

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Assistant

\$1.75 each, for volumes as fol.:

Any year from 1889 to 1905—average about 450pp.

These volumes will prove a valuable addition to any preacher's working library. They are filled with available material for Pulpit preparation for ordinary and special occasions.

Single numbers of any we may have on hand may be had for 10c each. Try several numbers—you will find them valuable.

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Magazine

Special Price \$1.00 each, Prepaid—Great Value

Complete set of 11 volumes, \$10.00, not prepaid. Each volume contains about 576pp, 6¼x9½ in. They sold originally at \$2.50 each, or \$21.00 the set, and are fully worth that price to any minister.

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets fully 50c worth, and more! Try one!

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

WANTED—Bible Champions January to July, incl., 1913; also April, June, July, 1914; also September and October, 1917. State price and condition. Address E. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy Faussett's Bible Cyclopaedia; copy Giant Cities of Bashan by Porter. Give condition and price. Address D. C. B., Lock Box 176, Saratoga, Cal.

FOR SALE—Talmage's sermons, cloth binding, 20 Vols.; Homiletic Review, cloth binding, 30 Vols.; Treasury of Religious Thought, cloth binding, published by E. B. Treat & Co., 22 Vols., and a lot of other good religious books at low prices. List on request. John G. Vance, Union, N. H.

FOR SALE—Set 6 large 8vo. Universal Encyclopaedic Dictionary, good as new, cloth, with total of 4,731 pp; will sacrifice for \$7.50. Also set 10 volumes Six Thousand Years of History, like new, for \$10.00. Also set 20 vols. O. T. Homiletic Commentary, cloth, like new, for \$17.00. All prepaid east of Rockies—west of Rockies add \$1.00 per set toward postage. Address T. U. V., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Fundamentals and their Contrast, *Buckley*, (1.25) for 65c; The Kingdom in History & Prophecy, *Chafer*, (\$1.00) for 60c; Looking for the Saviour, *Mauro*, (\$1.00) for 60c; God's Love & God's Children, *Mauro*, (1.00) for 60c. Beginnings of New England *Fiske*, (\$2.00) for 75c; Chosen of God, *Lathe*, (1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman*, (\$1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship*, (\$1.00) for 60c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Decision of Character, *Foster* (\$1.00) for 50c; Return of the Lord Jesus, *Torry*, (\$1.00) for 75c. All postpaid at price named. Address M. N. O., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost \$1.50 each. Will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Scientific Faith, *Johnston*; Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin*; The Deathless Book, *Mears*; Progress of Religious Freedom, *Schaff*; The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns*; Bible Steps unto Heaven, *Carpenter*; Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner*; Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter*; The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*. Address N. O. P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Like New Books—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, \$1.25; Origin & History of the Books of Bible, *Stowe*, 8vo., \$1.00; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8vo., \$1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough*, 8vo., \$1.00; Psychology—the Motive Power, *McCosh*, 50c; The Old Way, *Rhoads*, 50c; Bird's Eye View of Life of Christ, 35c; All like new, all prepaid. Address S. L. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why Four Gospels." Give conditions and price. Address Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—About one half and less. Philosophy of Religion, *Hoofding*, cost \$4.00, for \$2.50; Theology of Old Testament, 2 vols., *Oehler*, \$1.50; Alfred's Greek Testament, 5 vols., \$4.00; Creed of Christendom, 3 vols., *Schaff*, like new, \$4.00; Systematic Theology, 2 vols., *Miley*, cost \$6.00, for \$3.00, new P. Wiseman, 910 Bank St., Ottawa, Can.

SALE—World's Parliament of Religions, new, 2 vols., morocco, \$3.00. Address J. K. L., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Letter Copying Press, perfect condition, like new, cost \$8.00, for \$2.50. Address H. I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP—Prices in parenthesis are what books cost new. 8vo. in parenthesis are what books cost new. The Broken Seal, *Green*, (\$1.50) for 35c; *Hamilton's* Mexican Hand Book, Ills., (\$1.50) for 35c; Relations of the Republic and Laws of Religious Corporations, *Kynett*, (\$2.50) for 50c; Christ for India, *Lucas*, (\$2.00) for 50c; *Dewey's* Works (\$2.50) for 75c. All fully worth price asked. All sent prepaid. Address O. P. R., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Bible Commentary—Just like new. Lange's on Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, James, Revelation. Will sell for \$1.50 any single vol., or \$10 for the 8 vols. Prepaid east of Rockies. Address P. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

New Books Cheap—All Matters Tend to Rotation, *Hamilton* (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Doubters and their Doubts, *Darling*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Probation & Punishment, *Burns*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Sanctified Spice, *Peters*, (\$1.75) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor*, (\$1.75) for 50c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 25c; The Yoke, *Piper*, (\$1.50) for 25c; The Counter, *Tenor Voice*, (\$1.00) for 40c; *Wasson's* Religious, Social & Political Essays, (\$1.50) for 75c; Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Jonah in Fact and Fancy, *Banks* (75c) for 35c. All prepaid. Address R. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Eckholm*, (\$1.50) for 90c; Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Christ, His Nature and Work, (\$1.75) for \$1.10; The Teaching of Jesus, *Burrell*, (75c) for 45c; Up in Maine, 6th Ed. *Day*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild* (\$1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Set Kipling's Stories, 5 vols., in original box, (\$2.50) for \$1.25; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (50c) for 75c; Revivals, How and When, *Newell*, (\$1.25) for 65c. Address, S. T. U., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Vols. 1, 2, 3 Bible Student and Teacher—either bound or unbound. Name price and give condition. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 29.


February, 1923

No. 2.

EDITORIAL

Bates---Fosdick

Dr. Bates, Bible Champion Editor, accepts invitation of Professor-Precacher, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D., Union Theological Seminary Professor, First Presbyterian Church Precacher, New York City

 HAVE received your broadcasted sermon, "The New Knowledge and the Christian Faith," for which I thank you. With it is a printed slip which says, "Your comments upon this sermon would be read with great interest and appreciation."

Thus invited, with considerable reluctance yet with somewhat of inward urge, I offer the comments which follow. You will pardon me if I go beyond the mere text of the discourse and consider not only it, but also what is implied, indeed contained, in it as part of a system, propaganda, drive.

I am a Fundamentalist, and you are a "liberal" (I notice you do not capitalize that word. Because it is so common a noun?), "speaking," as you say, "from the viewpoint of liberal opinions."

DISSENT

I cannot assent to your treatment of the Fundamentalists, nor consent, altogether, to the character you attribute to the two classes. I quote:

"The Fundamentalists have a program that is essentially illiberal and intolerant." "The Fundamentalists are out on a campaign to shut against them [the liberals] the doors of the Christian fellowship." "The Fundamentalists are driving in their stakes to mark out the dead line of doctrine around the church." "The Fundamentalists are giving us one of the worst exhibitions of bitter intolerance that the churches of this country have ever seen." "They say that the liberals must go. Well, if the Fundamentalists should succeed, then out of the Christian church would go some of the best Christian life and consecration—multi-

tudes of men and women, devout and reverent Christians."

Fierce Fundamentalists! lovely liberals!

THE FUNDAMENTALIST

It is well sometimes, to see ourselves as others see us. I have noticed in addition to your characterization—"illiberal and intolerant"—other quite consonant, liberal-cult, decorative designations: such as mediaevalist, obscurantist, obstructionist, reactionary, non-progressive, narrow minded, no scholar, no scientist, uneducated, uncultured, ignoramus, back number, mossback, 100 per cent. bigot, and when it comes to those pesky premillennialists (Fundamentalists to a man), traditionalists, cranky, crass literalists, and hopelessly benighted. A liberal in *The Congregationalist* of Sept. 14, sweetly says: "At present we have in this country two bands of Paul Prys whose legitimate descent and whose far decline from Puritanism are evident. One is the Ku Klux Klan, strictly so called, and the other is the sect of the Fundamentalists."

I somehow do not seem to recognize myself in this deft portraiture. I am hoping it will turn out that these skilful limners have their optical lenses at least a bit out of focus,—strabismic, cross-eyed.

And you speak of "this Fundamentalist controversy," and of "churches making of themselves a cockpit of controversy." Who, I would like to know, is sharpening and adjusting the gaffs for this fowl proceeding if not yourself and your confreres?

Really, there does seem to be some difference between the two classes! But it is hardly worth while to bandy epithets. Quite as you

say: "Intolerance solves no problems. This is not a lesson which the Fundamentalists alone need to learn; the liberals also need to learn it." I should think as much!

THE LIBERAL

"Essentially illiberal and intolerant." May I have another word along this line? Not at all in a *tu quoque* spirit, but for a proper polemic locating of our assailants—which I would hope might prove a salutary seeing themselves as others see them—I call, as expert range-finder, the erudite Professor, Leander S. Keyser, of the Lutheran Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, who in the October BIBLE CHAMPION magazine, came to the defense of a Christian scientist against the violent and virulent assaults of a liberal State University professor. Only, in the quotation, now read "liberal" in the place of *evolutionist*; for all liberals are evolutionists.

Says Dr. Keyser: "My recent experiences with evolutionists in newspaper discussions, lead me to say that they out-dogmatise all the theological dogmatists of the Middle Ages. I have read many of the works of those great theologians, as well as those of earlier and later ages, but I must say that in dogmatism, oracular assertion, arrogant superiority, and contemptuous expression, they cannot hold a candle to the evolutionists with whom I have come in contact. The evolutionists are cock sure of everything. An air of superiority, a haughty mien, and an intolerant spirit—these seem to be their chief characteristics."

How inviting and winning to fellowship! Some of our liberal friends seem to belong not only to the church militant, but to the church belligerent, and even to the church termagant.

I am reminded of the Methodist revival. A bumptious, toplofty young fellow came forward to the altar, and a brother, in stentorian tones, prayed: "O Lord, take the lordly strut"—in fact, I think he said ungodly strut—"out of Ned Ingram." Ned got religion, and the strut was taken out of him.

But it is quite time to turn from the treatment of individuals to substance of doctrine.

THE OLD AND THE NEW—WHERE WE STAND

I, as a Fundamentalist, stand with, by, and for the Old Theology; you, as a liberal, stand with, by, and for the New Theology. You have your new-theology gospel, and I have the

old-theology gospel. The old-theology gospel has, through the ages, been the power of God unto salvation, for it has a divine dynamic in it. As to the insufficiency and impotence of the new-theology gospel, I cite your own Seminary colleague who, certainly, as your collaborateur, ought to be accounted a good witness.

At a Conference of Modernists in Cambridge, England, September, 1921, Professor Foakes Jackson read a paper in behalf of the liberal cult. As distancing all Anglican advocates, he says: "I know no better exponent than my colleague, Professor Harry Emerson Fosdick, in America;" and as to the dominance and even endurance of "this type of Liberal Christianity," he said:

"I venture to express my doubts on this point. Its weakness appears to me to be that it is unhistorical. It does not take account of the fact that the Christian religion is a living organism which has been subject to the law of growth and development, and that every step of its progress is the logical consequence of what is gone before. . . . Now practically to ignore this, or at least to explain it in a sense in which nobody has understood it for eighteen centuries, is to break completely the chain which links the church of the past with that of today. However eloquent these teachers may be, however elevated their morality, they are preaching something entirely alien from what was once meant by Christianity. They have lost the historical Christ and have not regained him by converting him into a social reformer, a moral legislator, a revealer of a new conception of God. They are really preaching an entirely new religion, and concealing the fact even from themselves by disguising it in the phraseology of the old, which as employed by them is sometimes without meaning."

"ANOTHER" GOSPEL

Here, I submit, is plain and unequivocal testimony from your twin liberal, so to speak, that your gospel is *not* the gospel of the Bible, —unquestionably "another gospel." This I charge upon you.

You are familiar with St. Paul's treatment of the "another gospel" question. Writing to the Galatians he said: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is not another; but there be some that would trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of

Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (i. 6-9).

If a modern Fundamentalist had said that, I doubt not the liberals would say not only that he was intolerant but intolerable. The Holy Spirit said it through the Apostle Paul; and when the judgment here denounced gets to hurtling around, I do not have the least fear of getting hit because I have preached, not "another," but the old gospel.

FUNDAMENTALIST AND LIBERAL MUTUALLY AND EXCLUSIVE TERMS

The words Fundamentalist and liberal, as you use them, seem to be mutually exclusive even though you would yoke the two parties together; and, reduced to the last analysis, I suppose the terms are just that, however much along their feather edges they may appear to—not intertwine or coalesce, but—overlap. In proof, let me cite yourself.

Willis W. Mead of Brooklyn, N. Y., a returned missionary from Turkey, sent me a print-copy of his communication to you, April 1921, and your reply thereto. Mr. Mead is a Fundamentalist and wrote from that standpoint. You say: "Of course you are quite well aware, as I am, that there is a deep and radical difference between your point of view with reference to Christian faith and my own. . . . You will see, therefore, that whenever I write a book"—or preach a sermon?—"it will be written not from your point of view but from a point of view at the opposite end of the Christian theological line from your own." Opposite end! Mutually exclusive, surely; and not only so, but oppugnant, as your sermon, this letter, and the whole course of this unfortunate controversy abundantly prove. And, necessarily, they always will be oppugnant unless the Fundamentalists surrender. The "old guard" never does that. Not very promotive of "fellowship." How can two walk together except they be agreed?"

TERMS DISCRIMINATED

It would seem to be desirable that there should be some statement as to what is included in the term "fundamental." The Standard Dictionary defines fundamental as "relating to or fulfilling the purpose of a

foundation or ground work; indispensable; primary; essential; basal." Some of the elements of fundamentalism are clear-cut, distinct, and while all of them are essential to the unity of the Christian Faith, possibly some should not be pressed as a *sine qua non* to salvation. Probably such discrimination does not matter very much anyhow, for if Fundamentalist and liberal are mutually exclusive terms, what is in fundamentalism is not contained in liberalism. Yet maybe something sharply specific may be arrived at.

I suppose the *fons et origo* of "the new knowledge" is the evolutionary philosophy. As you know, a fundamental working postulate of the evolutionary philosophy is *the denial of the intervention of the supernatural*. The Old Theology and the New Theology are therefore Supernaturalism vs. Naturalism. Says Lyman Abbott: "The New Theology denies absolutely the old assumed distinction between the natural and the supernatural." And says Kuenan: "So long as we allow the supernatural to intervene even in a single point so long our view of the whole continues to be incorrect." Whatever in fundamentalism has a supernatural content, that, therefore, liberalism categorically denies. That, logically and theologically, is precisely the situation. And let us get the fogs out of our minds and the dust out of our eyes and discern and declare that at this precise point is the final battle ground, and that here the battle is to be won or lost.

CHRISTIANITY WIPED OFF THE MAP?

A moment's pause just here, to see where we are "at." I believe your sermon was first put forth with the title, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" It is perfectly plain to me that if Liberalism wins Christianity is wiped off the map, all except its ethics, which it has in common with paganism. That in Christianity which is "indispensable, primary, essential, basal," that which distinguishingly constitutes Christianity what it is, *i.e.* the supernatural in it, is gone, and what is left is simply baptized paganism. Oh, it may be dressed up in fine literary garb by 'eloquent teachers' of 'elevated morality,' "disguising it in the phraseology of the old," but it is "something entirely alien from what was once meant by Christianity," "an entirely new religion." Ask Professor Jackson. If Fundamentalism does not win—good night! I know which side of this question I am on. Where are you?

VIRGIN BIRTH

First and foremost in the present modernist or liberal propaganda is the question of the Virgin Birth of Christ, which—after portraying the situation as to Fundamentalists—is your initial stress.

In *The Continent* of Oct. 5 is an editorial, "Why Not Be Fair With Fosdick?" The writer—his manifest sympathies evidently obfuscating his discernment—would have us believe, not that you deny the virgin birth, but that you are only pleading for the toleration of those who do deny it. When this fact of the virgin birth—perhaps at this stage I would better say allegation of the virgin birth—is, as you put it, "phrased in the terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use," *The Continent* owes you an apology for intimating that you—horrible *dictu*—have not a modern mind! No; if I understand the meaning of language and have any sense of the situation, you are the corypheus—"no better exponent" as Professor Jackson would say—of those who deny this fundamental doctrine. And as here is the crux, let me first consider the truth of the doctrine, and then your treatment of the record of it.

A MALODOROUS MESS

That Jesus "was conceived by the Holy Ghost" and "born of the Virgin Mary" as the Apostles' Creed says he was and as the Scriptures plainly affirm, is a fact or it is not; is a truth or a lie. If Jesus was not of Divine paternity he must have been of human paternity. The Scriptures expressly deny that Joseph was his father. His begetting and his birth must have been, then, out of wedlock, which undeniably makes his mother a woman of abandoned character and Jesus a bastard! There is no escape from this blasphemous and nasty conclusion. And to hitch Deity and the super-qualities that go to make up Jesus' now accepted character on to such a being—as so many ministers, to save their faces, are futilely trying to do—is a feat of theological and biological prestidigitation that should make a Kellar or a Hermann or a Houdini turn green with envy.

Let me quote from an editorial, "Accounting For All Facts," in the *BIBLE CHAMPION* magazine of February, 1922. It was written by a Cambridge professor who is a Congregationalist. He says:

"On a Sunday in December a prominent clergyman of an orthodox denomination

preached on the virgin birth. He took the ground that while he personally believed in the virgin birth, such a belief was not necessary to a saving Christian faith. What was necessary was belief in the divinity of Christ. It never dawned on his mentality that the two things are indissolubly connected, and that giving up belief in the virgin birth necessarily destroys a belief in Christ's divinity. When keen witted free-thinkers encounter such reasoning they promptly say—such men never mince words—that men advocating that sort of thing are either hypocrites or fools, and the worst of it is that they can make out a fairly good case! It is either virgin birth or bastardy, and bastardy is no foundation for divinity."

Far be it from me to say that any man in a Christian pulpit is a hypocrite or a fool; nor, I ween, would the Professor say so. He is simply letting George do it,—the keen-witted George.

GOD OR god

It should go without saying that denying the virgin birth is, ipso facto, a denial of the Deity of Christ. What then? Let it be admitted for the sake of the argument—which is of course the truth—that the Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, three personalities in one Being, is the one and only true God. He is God, and any other so called God is only a small god. If Christ be not Deity, then the Trinity is gone, and the God of Christian Theism gives place to the god of Modernism. It is a false god, and is no more the true God than are the idol-gods of wood and stone which the heathen worship, or to which a Fiji Islander bows down. This is precisely the logic of the situation, from which I see no escape. If yours is the god of modernism, or liberalism, then, from a theological point of view, a Fosdick or a Fiji has exactly the same and equal right to claim toleration from Christian theism. So when you speak of the vicarious atonement as "placating an abbreviated deity," it is plain that somebody is short on God but not on gods,—a god with a small g.

Says St. John: "No lie is of the truth. Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son hath not the Father" (1 John ii. 21-23). And Jesus says: "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me," and "I and the Father are one."

SUICIDAL

Your treatment of the record would be to me amazing if I had not ceased to be amazed at anything. Several years ago the Episcopal Church not only refused to "tolerate" Crapsey who committed doctrinal disdemeanors identical with yours, but cast him out, and now that an Episcopal bishop renounces and denounces the Lord's Supper as having its origin in and being the counterpart of cannibalism, it would seem as though the limit ought to be reached; and the latest Episcopal theological debacle to date is that of one who, in his book "Confessions of an Old Priest," renounces the faith on which Christian churches are founded, and says: "I confess I do this with the hope that after I have said all I have to say, the Church may decide that I and such as I have a place in its ministry." What the Episcopal Church will do with Bishop William Montgomery Brown of Arkansas and Dr. Samuel Davis McConnell remains to be seen.

It might be to the point to quote just here the distinguished Dutch theological professor, Van Oosterzee, who says: "No church summons ministers to contest her beliefs, and no one can demand of her an act of suicide in the name of progress and toleration,"—a dictum that I would most respectfully recommend to the officary of the First Presbyterian Church of New York City and of the New York Presbytery.

SEARCHLIGHT TURNED ON ALLEGED HISTORY

You tell us that "To believe in the virgin birth as an explanation of great personality is one of the familiar ways in which the ancient world was accustomed to account for unusual superiority."

The allegations of the divinity of ancient heathen heroes, we used to be taught were adumbrations, foreshadowings, prophecies, of the divine incarnation of Jesus and that they in a manner laid ground for and confirmed faith in that coming event. This teaching was, it now seems, all wrong for, according to your use of them, they discredit that event. I confess it strikes me unpleasantly, your classification of Jesus with Buddha, Zoroaster and Lao-tsze, who you tell us "According to the records of their faiths . . . were all supernaturally born," and with Pythagoras and Plato and Augustus Cæsar, "and many more" who were "called virgin born."

Now, the all-important fact in Jesus' virgin birth was not so much his maternity as his Divine paternity. You may have sources of information to which I do not have access, but I am unable to find in a single case of the names here listed a *claim to divine paternity!*

Do you wonder that I am amazed, almost?

History tells us that the father of Buddha was Suddhodana, king of Kapilavastu. The name of Zoroaster's father is given as Pourushaspa. Little authentic is known of Loa-tsze's life, for his followers have made a myth of his biography. According to their legends his father was 70 years old before he was married and his mother was 40, and he was 80 years in his mother's womb. Pythagoras, a native of the island of Samos, was son of Mnesarchus, a merchant. Plato was of good family, being connected on the mother's side with Solon, and on the father's side with Codrus, one of the ancient kings of Athens. Augustus Cæsar was son of Octavius, a Roman senator and pretor, who died when Augustus was four years old, and his mother was Atia, a niece of Julius Cæsar.

In view of the foregoing, what becomes of the claim that these men were "supernaturally" or "virgin" born? Most certainly I would, in *Continent* phrase, "be fair with Fosdick," but isn't it perfectly just and proper for me to ask, Are you fair with Jesus Christ and with facts of history?

SURD MATHEMATICS

You say "The two men who contributed most to the church's thought of the divine meaning of Christ were Paul and John, who never even distantly allude to the virgin birth."

I have become exceedingly fatigued with the oft iteration of the idea that since the virgin birth is mentioned in the New Testament only twice—by Matthew and Luke—and that none of the other writers mention it, the voluminous Paul and John not even distantly alluding to it, we may therefore reject it. What sort of reasoning is that? What becomes of the well-known principle of Jewish jurisprudence to which Jesus appealed when he confuted his inquisitors, "It is also written in your law that the testimony of two men is true?" (John viii. 17).

The Ten Commandments are given only twice in the Old Testament—in Exodus and Deuteronomy—and they are not given in any other Books. Shall we therefore discard

them? That 4×4 equals 16, is mentioned but once in the multiplication table—positively but once—therefore out with it! Who does not know that all mathematical calculation proceeds upon the principle that 4×4 equals 16? We have the equivalents though: $4 \times 2 \times 2$ equals 16; 2×8 equals 16; $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ equals 16. And who does not know that though the virgin birth is mentioned but twice explicitly, the whole New Testament proceeds upon the implication that it is true?

Matthew and Luke state it. Mark: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (i. 1), the phrase "Son of God" applied to Jesus unequivocally carrying to the Jewish mind the idea that He was "equal with God" (John v. 18). John: "In the beginning was the Word; the Word was God; and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us" (i. 1, 14). Paul: "Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever" (Rom. ix. 5). Peter: "Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi. 6; John vi. 69.) Thomas: "My Lord, and my God" (John xx. 28). Devils, "Christ the Son of God" (Lk. iv. 41).

INTERPRETATION—REPUDIATION

I note your hospitality to different interpretations of the virgin birth. "H. S. H." in an editorial in *The Christian Work*, Oct. 28, says: "Dr. Fosdick has said that a man's view of the Virgin Birth has nothing to do with his being a Christian. Some Christians accept it in a physical and external sense; some Christians understand it as an assertion of Christ's genuine humanity. The Fundamentalists say you cannot be a Christian unless you accept the Virgin Birth in the sense in which we understand it. Dr. Fosdick differs entirely from that position—as do we."

I had some thrifty church members who released themselves from the obligation of the tithe by what they called a "difference of interpretation." Their interpretation was repudiation, and they kept their cash. Good "H. S. H." should note the difference between interpretation and repudiation. There is a legal rule of interpretation, so lawyers say, that has been in use in all the courts of the civilized world for centuries, viz.: "That a speaker in his public speech shall be taken and held to mean 'that which a person of ordinary intelligence listening to him would understand him to mean, unless he expressly stated at the time that he used the words in a dif-

ferent sense." I submit that any "person of ordinary intelligence" would get no other meaning of Matthew's and Luke's account of the virgin birth than that which lies plainly on the face of it, which isn't the "liberal" interpretation, or repudiation rather. "Ordinary" people do not resort to heavy exegetical malpractice to get rid of evident meanings

INSPIRATION

The next doctrine you treat is Inspiration of the Bible. Little need be adduced on this point further than to say the common doctrine of the unique, plenary, theopneustic (God in-breathed) inspiration of the Scriptures you controvert, and reject as of course you must from your philosophical point of view, as that requires the intervention of the supernatural, which, per liberalism, is impossible. Let me say I do not propose to give up my Bible, which not simply contains the Word of God, but which *is* the Word of God, as our Presbyterian standards affirm it to be—Form of Gov't. Chap. xv. xii. 1, Larger Catechism, Q4—for a maltreated, maimed, torn, patched, shredded, darned, decorticated, emasculated, eviscerated, gassed, jazzed bible, to meet the demands of a merely human philosophy. The Astruc-Eichhorn-et-al. destructive higher criticism utterly collapsed years ago; and why shouldn't it collapse since it is, as Professor Baxter, of St. Andrews, Aberdeen, Scotland, in his "Sanctuary and Sacrifice," says, "certainly the biggest and most pretentious wind-bag that was ever filled with vacuity."

REGENERATION

There is indispensable Regeneration, a fundamental surely, for Scripture says: "Except a man [Gr. *tis*, any one] be born again [Gr. be begotten from above] he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John iii. 3). That demands the intervention of the supernatural, but as that cannot be, there must be universal doom of humanity to the eternal outside. Rather illiberal for liberals to concoct such a plight as that. Fundamentalists feel that they have Divine warrant for proffering something better, even a supernatural regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

So I might go on through the catalog, miracles and all, where supernatural intervention is called for; but time would fail me.

TROUBLERS OF ISRAEL

I must say a word as to your charge that the Fundamentalists are the trouble makers.

And "H. S. H." in the editorial in *The Christian Work*, "The Attack on Dr. Fosdick." Oct. 28, says: "It is worth remembering always that Dr. Fosdick did not start this controversy. The Fundamentalists did." And says another liberal: "If the faith of any of the Chinese students is being upset by their professors (if they are modernists), you who have taught them an antiquated theology and conception of the Bible"—(by which of course must be meant the old historic faith of the Church)—"are to blame, and not the professors." This is side-splitting.

Oh, I have heard this sort of talk *ad nauseam*: Ahab accused Elijah of being the troubler of Israel. Elijah: "I have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord" (1 K. xviii. 17). Brer Wolf accused the lamb down stream of roiling the waters up where he was. When the good man of the house was aroused by the burglar looting the home, trouble began, but of course he of the jimmy, the flashlight and pistol was the innocent party!

You know as well as I do that Fundamentalist doctrine is and has been through the ages the historic faith of the Church. But it has been attacked. It was attacked by Celsus of the second century, of whom Kurtz says: "His polemic was acute but superficial, sarcastic but dishonest"; and by Porphyry of the third century, who wrote fifteen books *Kata Christianon*. Dr. Shedd, once professor in the Seminary where you are, speaks of "the Platonic infidels Prophyry and Celsus," and says they "compared the account of the life and actions of Christ recorded in the gospels, with the popular narrations in the Greek and Roman mythologies and placed him in the catalogue of the pagan heroes and demi-gods. They did not deny his historical existence, it should be noticed, but asserted that his disciples had craftily given currency to an exaggerated and false picture of the life of a sincere and good man" (Hist. of Doct. Z. 118).

That sounds very familiar and quite up to date, although some modern liberals go those ancient infidels one better, and deny Christ's actual historical existence. And you know as well as I do that certain modernist contentions in this controversy are but a recrudescence of that old infidelity, the "new knowledge" begetting that old foe, but with a new face, if indeed it be new.

In the *Chicago Journal of Religion*, July 1922, is an article, "The Conservative Reaction in China," by Rev. Paul Hutchinson, a Methodist missionary. He recognizes the unity, peace, co-operation, and great success that attended the conservatives through the years up to the inception of the revolution in 1898. Speaking of certain Fundamentalist visitors to China, he says: "All these visitors have sent back to the countries supporting the missions descriptions of the havoc being wrought by liberal missionaries in China. A liberal, following in their footsteps, has no difficulty in reporting havoc wrought by the conservative visitors." Quite so, quite so. But who is responsible for the havoc: those who so long have held the fields in prosperous and peaceful possession or the modernist irruptors and interrupters who broke the peace? It is a case of Brer Wolf redivivus, of which there is overwhelming proof. Please henceforth place the responsibility for this trouble where it belongs.

There is a question of manners and morals involved that calls for consideration.

MANNERS

I have preached very many times in Baptist pulpits, and while I entirely dissent from the Baptist exclusive claims as to the mode and subjects of baptism, I have always had the courtesy, not to say decency, not to attack this Baptist fundamental, *i.e.* fundamental to them as Baptists, though, happily, not as Christians. If I had committed such an atrocious breach of good manners, I am quite sure the Baptists would not have "tolerated" me, but quite likely have assisted me to depart. Good manners would dictate that the place to differ with Baptists as Baptists is not inside but outside the Baptist inclosure.

Back about 1896, at a meeting of the Presbyterian ministerial association in the city of Rochester, N. Y., the Rev. Nelson Millard, D.D., the able and brilliant pastor of the First Presbyterian Church there, quoting 1 John i. 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin," said with a deprecatory wave of his hand, "Nobody believes that sort of thing nowadays." My hot protest started a quick chorus of dissent that showed he was quite alone in his misbelief. He did the manly, honorable, honest—shall I not say decent?—thing of peaceably withdrawing from the denomination with whose doctrines he had ceased to be in sympathy.

The Rev. Herbert M. Gesner, an alumnus of Princeton University ('90), of a New York law school ('92), and of Auburn Theological Seminary ('95), after pastorates in Saratoga Springs and Atlantic City, resigned after seven years of service as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Easton, Pa. It is understood that he did so, not because of any dissension or disharmony in the congregation, nor because of a call to another church—he was not a Presbyterian for revenue—but solely because he had come into discord with Presbyterian doctrines and into accord with Unitarianism; and he therefore thought it his duty to leave the Presbyterian fold and ally himself with the program of the Unitarian denomination. This seems to me to be the manly, honorable, honest—shall I not again say decent?—thing to do, and not to do so seems to me unmanly, dishonorable, dishonest, indecent. Mr. Gesner can now preserve his own self-respect and retain the respect of other people, who nevertheless regret his lapse.

I leave this question of etiquette right here, and not seek to rub it in where apparently it is so much needed, but simply note that Presbyterians—Fundamentalist ones, too—are liberal enough to be willing that their customary carriage should be copied by those of all other faiths.

MORALS

And a question of morals also seems to me to be involved in the liberal contention and conduct.

In one of the up-state cities of New York a liberal minister went one evening to call upon the pastor of one of the two churches of their denomination there. The liberalist became so outrageously unorthodox that the pastor said: "No more of that kind of talk here, please, or I shall ask you to leave." A little later the visitor officiated at the administration of the Lord's Supper at the opening of an ecclesiastical meeting, and his communion address was as sweetly and soundly orthodox as the most spiritual and devoted Christian could desire. Afterwards the pastor spoke to him of the difference between his discourse and his evening talk at the parsonage and he answered, "Oh, no matter what I believe, I have to observe the conventions." Does liberalism beget such a moral, or I should say immoral, sense as that? I have never known fundamentalism to produce such fruit.

A pastorate in a Rocky Mountain city became vacant. An elder of the church went back to visit his old mid-Pennsylvania home. He interviewed the pastor of the third largest church in a presbytery of fifty-nine churches. In a two-hour conversation they did not seem to be getting anywhere, and the elder finally asked, "Do you believe in God?" The minister replied, "I don't know whether I do or not." Do young men come out from under your hands so thus deficient in moral sense, not to say theological equipment, that they will permit themselves to assume, or continue in, the sacred function of a minister in the Presbyterian Church? Not an impertinent question I am sure, for this young minister is an alumnus of Union Theological Seminary. What becomes of the editorial in *The Continent*, Nov. 16, p. 1431, "In the Presbyterian ministry today there are in reality none but evangelicals." I cannot but wonder which is the vaster: the editors lack of information or his phenomenal credulity.

The First Presbyterian Church of New York City was founded and built under the provisions of a Confession of Faith and Form of Government which unequivocally affirm fundamentals of the Christian faith which your ministry is assaulting and undermining. How you can use a building, benefit by endowments, receive a salary from the church, for such ministration, presents a question of right that perhaps you have an answer to, but I have not. I had an intimate friend, a Congregational minister, who with his wife had money they wished to devote to educational purposes in college or seminary. That was at the time of the Andover slump some forty or more years ago. They made their wills so that their fortune would go to the American Bible Society. Said the minister to me: "How can I put my money where I shall have no security but that in the future it may be used to propagate doctrines that my soul abhors?" A New York business man said to him: "If in Wall street a man was guilty of such malfeasance as Andover is guilty of, he would be put behind the bars." For more than twenty-five years I was a member of the Synod of New York, and so was in the Alexander—Duffield-Parkhurst zone, and how these men, active or emeriti pastors of this church, can stand for such ministry presents a problem that, though I have taken mathematics up to the quaternions and the fourth dimension, I

can form an equation into which any factors of manners or morals in my tables will fit.

Let not the foregoing be construed as of the campaign, which you charge, to drive the liberals out. Such exit-proceedings do not accord with the prevalent and popular religiously-flabby and loose-girt spirit of the times. I must "observe the conventions." But I could not mourn, however, if the foregoing should serve as a tremendous stimulus to the liberal sense of the fitness of things. Then there might ensue, if of course the liberals should think best, what was written in the Acts of the Apostles: "And being let go, they went to their own company." Ask Mr. Gesner.

IMPOTENCE OR WORSE

I cannot refrain from speaking of what is to me one of the most distressing features of this liberal "another gospel" ministry.

When George F. Pentecost was pastor in Brooklyn, a distinguished minister in one of the great avenue churches in New York asked him to come over and conduct some evangelistic meetings in his church. Dr. Pentecost answered in surprise, "Why, you do not believe in the Christ and the atonement which I preach." The minister replied: "I know that very well, but I also know that if anybody is to be converted it must be by means of the old view." Which—human impotence or divine power?

A missionary in Japan, whose minister-father was years a near neighbor and close friend of mine, came home. I asked three missionaries from Japan the reason of the return. They all gave substantially the same answer: "New Theology—he had no saving gospel to preach." He was made Dean of a great theological seminary in this country, to educate more missionaries, or something.

If you have tears to shed, I think it fitting they should fall at least just here. In the Philadelphia *The Presbyterian*, October 26, page 4, is a letter to the Editor signed "Layman." Layman became interested in a Japanese student who was studying in this country, often had him a guest in his home, and with Bible in hand faithfully tried to lead him to Christ. Let me quote:

"We felt that our testimony was being owned of God and that our friend was 'almost persuaded.' At this time, he left our city to undertake some special work in New York. While there, he was taken by some other students to hear Dr. Fosdick at the First Pres-

byterian Church. He attended quite regularly during his stay in New York. Upon his return to our city, he was quite elated over what he had heard from this very distinguished leader in one of the most prominent Presbyterian pulpits in America. He had received the impression that Christianity was not the only and final religion, that the death of Christ upon the cross was not in atonement for the sins of the world. In fact, everything that we had taught him concerning these great truths was not, as we had contended, fundamental. He felt that Christ was a great teacher and leader and example. He could not understand how it was that I, a Presbyterian layman, believed as I did, when one of the outstanding preachers in a Presbyterian pulpit preached and taught the very opposite. He has returned to Japan with the modern ideas concerning the person and work of our Lord, and will no doubt inform his associates of the views held by many American Christians."

Are you satisfied with this—shall I say commendation or condemnation?—of your ministry? My own eyes are not dry now as I think, could this indictment be charged against me, what answer I should make to my Lord and Master when I stand before Him and He asks me if I was loyal to Him and faithful to souls He died to save.

APOSTASY

And this "another gospel" is the gospel that "from the viewpoint of liberal opinions" is to be preached to convert the world to Christ! What a ghastly farce! No Trinity; no Jesus Christ as God; no Bible that is the Word of God; no atonement for the sins of the world, for "without shedding of blood is no remission;" no indispensable regeneration by the personal Holy Spirit; no anything that posits the supernatural. It is now easy to see how the apostasy toward which the visible—not the invisible—church is headlong headed with a rush that is breaking the speed limit, is to be brought about, so that "when the Son of Man cometh shall He find the Faith on the earth?" (Lk. xviii. 8).

A word as to Apostasy. A footnote to 2 Tim. iii. 1, in the Scofield Bible says: "Apostasy, 'falling away,' is the act of professed Christians who deliberately reject revealed truth (1) as to the deity of Jesus Christ, and (2) redemption through his atoning and redeeming sacrifice. (1 Jno. iv. 1-3; Phil. iii. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 1). . . . Apostates depart from

the faith but not from the outward profession of Christianity (iii.5).

HERESY AND ITS TREATMENT

And a word as to heresy and its treatment. Heresy is determined by standards. The Standard Dictionary defines a heretic as "An actual or former member of a church, or whose allegiance is claimed by it, who holds religious opinions contrary to the fundamental doctrines and tenets of that church."

Presbyterian heresy, then, is a departure from the "fundamental doctrines and tenets of" Presbyterianism. Accordingly, liberalism as such, whether promulgated from professors' chairs in Presbyterian seminaries or parroted from Presbyterian or other pulpits, is Presbyterian heresy.

And the Scriptures prescribe the treatment of heretics: Titus iii. 10, "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition, reject."

The application to the present situation seems rather plain, but I prefer not to point it out. I might ask, though, if this Scripture prescription, "Reject," is a specimen capsule of Fundamentalist intolerance?

Evolution of Literary Appreciation—8 Chelt

I cannot forego the courtesy of expressing my high appreciation of the many excellencies in your books, some of which quickly arrived at the covetable stage of "best sellers." They have captivated thousands upon thousands. While cheerfully bestowing my meed of due praise, may I modestly offer a caveat?

One of the most spiritual minded and devoted Christian women in my circle of acquaintance called upon me, and, holding up a volume, said: "Oh, there are so many beautiful and helpful things in this book, but I feel there is something lacking; please tell me what it is."

The book was your "Meaning of Prayer," which I own and had read. I at once sensed her difficulty. You are strong on the personal reflex influence of prayer, which all Christians should glory in, but how about the outward objectives that the ministry of intercession pleads for?

In the next block is a Presbyterian church in which a college professor teaches a Bible class. A pupil tells me he has taught them "There is no such thing as an objective answer to prayer; what seems to be such is simply coincidence." He is an evolutionist, and from his evolutionary-philosophy point of view his

teaching is correct; but who does not know that from the Bible standpoint it is infidel?

Outward objective answer to prayer means the intervention of the supernatural, which if once admitted opens a crevasse through which will logically flow the whelming destructive flood that will sweep away the whole evolutionary philosophy which holds that creation, history, civilization, in a word all that is progressive and evolvable is, as Prof. E. D. Cope puts it, "accomplished by the energies which are intrinsic in evolution, without the interference of agencies which are external to it;" or, as Le Conte puts it: "A continuous progressive change, according to certain laws and by means of resident forces."

So, if the "Meaning of Prayer" and "Christianity and Progress" predicate only naturalism, as your philosophy requires, a truly spiritual sense will recognize a sad deficiency. Shakespeare's "Hamlet" with Hamlet left out may still be good literature, but it isn't Shakespeare's play. Christian-pagan ethics have their proper place in "progress," but more—a divine dynamic—is required, and that the "new knowledge" does not provide for.

LIBERALISM'S WORKOUT

It surely is a matter of gratulation that there are lovely liberals who exhibit "some of the best Christian life and consecration—multitudes of men and women, devout and reverent Christians." They belong to the present generation. What about the future generation? What produced such lovely character—the old-theology gospel or the new-theology gospel? fundamentalism or modernism?

I quote again from Dr. Pentecost: "One of the most distinguished scholars of the advanced school of Higher Criticism frankly confessed to me that his conversion and present peace with God were based on the vicarious and substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, and that even now in daily asking for the forgiveness of sins he always appealed to the divine sacrifice of Christ as evangelicals understand it. At the same time he declared that he could not, himself, preach *that* gospel, on account of its unphilosophical and unscientific character." That is to say, for his own peace and salvation he still depends on the old faith, which perhaps he learned at his mother's knee, but he can himself, no longer preach it to others!

This is no parable, but plain didactic. With fundamentalism ousted and no lingering increment of its divine power operative, with

liberalism in its place an impotent force as a substitute and a subterfuge, it is perfectly plain what type of Christianity—if it can be called Christianity—will be produced in the next generation.

A liberal pastor of a First Congregational church preached his farewell sermon preceding his taking a college position in his city. He is reported to have said—I quote from the *Topeka Daily Herald* of Dec. 30, 1901—"The shortest road to redeem the world is to get young men and teach them evolution, modern theism, and higher criticism." I have seen that sort of stuff worked out, and here is the result: A slaughter house of faith, and a morgue of piety. A public school teacher was an efficient Christian worker in my church. She went to Chicago University for summer-school work to advance her in her profession. She returned, but left her Christian efficiency and her church endeavor in the University abattoir. Depend upon it, liberalism that is anti-fundamentalism has a stranglehold upon the spirituality—the Holy Spirit-uality—of Christian life.

While I am about it, let me give another specimen of liberalism's workout. I do not say it is just the type of liberalism you stand for, but it is your liberalism come to full flower and fruitage.

A liberal professor of geology in an Eastern college, having a discussion with a devout Christian geologist, persisted in not confining himself to his science, but would insist on invading the domain of religion. Hear him: "The whole idea of supernatural revelation as a necessary basis of religion, is bunk. Jesus Christ never taught it, and it has done more harm to the cause of religion than almost anything else. . . . Natural law is all that is necessary for any religion. . . . I despise your theology, and I shall fight it whenever I get a chance. I am confident you can't make much of an impression on the younger generation, and they are the ones we evolutionists are concerned with." I recall that there is something about fellowship in 2 Cor. vi 14, 15.

Two ministers, classmates, for a time took their "constitutional" playing croquet,—Presbyterian grass-billiards it used to be called. One of them became so expert that if he went through the first two arches and got hold of his opponent's ball, he would often go the whole round and win the game in the one play. Repeatedly when the ball of number two was nabbed before the third arch, he would ex-

claim with a sigh: "Nothing but a dispensation of divine providence can save me now." If evolutionism becomes enthroned in college teaching and liberalism in theological seminary teaching, it looks as though the workout will be such that only a dispensation of divine providence can keep the liberals from winning. I still have a lingering faith in Providence.

SITUATION—PROSPECT

In this writing I am more concerned to define a situation than to rebut a system. Plainly, in this controversy there are only two positions that can properly be permitted, logically and theologically, and you and I represent them. We are, as you said to Mr. Mead, "at the opposite end of the Christian theological line." Supernaturalism vs. naturalism.

But between us there are many dearly loved brethren—middle-of-the-rovers I suppose they would prefer to be called—whose vital Christian experience and biblico-theological studies locate them undeniably with the conservatives; but no, that won't do, for, breathed upon by the spirit of the times, they must not be moss-backs, but must be progressive, up to date, scientific, philosophical, and all those lovely camouflaging things. Alas, their consistency is in a state of cruel collapse, and, sub rosa, I have my private opinion as to their sanity. But now an awful fix awaits them, thanks to you, yes *you*, beloved Brother (you know we are members of the same college fraternity,) Rev. Professor Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D.

Your broadcasted sermon has precipitated the crisis which I have long foreseen must sooner or later come. The action of the Philadelphia Presbytery in overturning the next May General Assembly—an action that I am sure will have large presbyterial concurrence—will present an issue that can neither be evaded nor avoided, an issue that liberalism obtrusively has forced upon the Fundamentalists. So don't blame us Fundamentalist little lambs for the roiled, rushing waters. Yet I recall that one of Horace Bushnell's most terrific sermons was on "The Wrath of the Lamb."

My dear Professor, you are certainly *It* this time. You et al were that previously, only you were using a reverse current and so accusing us wrongfully. And, believe me, my animadversion—(my version it not *mad*, but saccharinely good natured)—is not against you personally, not a bit, but simply and solely against your teaching. And I hope, and think, I am speaking for Fundamentalists generally.

The old saying was: "God loves the sinner, but hates his sin." Just so I love liberals, but their liberalism,—well, that is another matter. "H. S. H." should revise the title of his *Christian Work* editorial, "The Attack on Dr. Fosdick." This is a war of ideas; let it not be of men.

My view of situation and prospects may perhaps be more clearly set forth by my referring to a magazine article I had thirteen years ago, on "Is There A Modern Theology?" I said: "Dr. Ingram, Bishop of London, evidently understood what he was talking about when, in this country, he said: 'The future lies with no Church which sinks to the level of what is called the New Theology.' Then, asking the question, 'Is It Separation?'" I continued:

"But it may be asked: 'Are there not points of argument between the Old and New such that they can work together?' They are at one—for the most part at least—in their ethics and in the practical moralities of life. I see no reason why they may not work together accordingly there, and even fellowship in 'social' activities such pagan moralists as Seneca and Marcus Aurilius. But churches down on that level are not churches; they are only, to use the language of Mr. Dawson, 'social clubs, united by moral ideals, rather than spiritual communities quick with a divine fire.' Jesus Christ is a Saviour; the Church was instituted and exists for the salvation of men. As has, I trust, been made very plainly to appear, *the New Theology has no salvation in it*. From that point of view there is, between the Old and the New, no concord, but only antagonism. And how can two walk and work together except they be agreed? I think it would be well if all in the churches, and outside the churches too, could see—what some of us are coming to see clearly—that the logic of the situation produced by so called 'modern thought,' in the theological realm, is undeniably, inexorably, and irresistibly, just this:

Bible or no Bible; Church or no Church; Jesus Christ as the Son of God (His Deity) or Jesus Christ merely human; salvation by grace or salvation only by culture. And he will have to be an agile acrobat, theologically, who can keep from taking one side or the other of these alternatives."

The time I prophesied thirteen years ago has come, and, thanks to the liberal persistent propaganda, by the very force of circumstances the beloved middle-of-the-roaders, willy

nilly, will be compelled to align themselves on one side or the other. This is the fix they are in. Two years ago I was talking with an irenic United Presbyterian theological professor, who said with a tone of regret in his voice: "I fear the time is soon coming when there will have to be a new alignment, and it will be, not along denominational lines, but along the line of the fundamentals." And I trust this matter of "toleration" will have righteous adjudication and adjustment. And let it be understood that the question now is not one of amenity towards men, but of loyalty toward God, loyalty to the Incarnate and Written Word.

May I put in just here a further and parenthetic word *in re* toleration? As emanating from the precincts of Union Theological Seminary, your clarion call for toleration has an overtone that produces a decidedly fuzzy sound as it strikes my auditory nerve. The last meeting of the Synod of New York before it became a delegated body, was held in 1883 in the church in which you preach. I sat but a few feet from Professor Briggs when in a speech he plumply told the Premillennialists—in no dove-cooing cadence either—they must quit or get out! That pronouncement seems to have had something of the boomerang in it, for ten years later the Presbyterian Church refused to tolerate, but "rejected" him. The Premillennialists stayed on.

FINALLY

Such are the invited comments I offer upon your sermon. If they shall "be read with great interest," I would hope they might have equal "appreciation;" but I have my doubts about that.

This Letter is long, yet I do not know that any apology is necessary, for in Commentaries I have read pages of comment upon even a single verse, and I suppose that in your department you teach your students that it is entirely good form for a sermon to be longer than the text on which it discourses.

These be parlous and perilous times; but for myself let me say: Palsied be my tongue if it would utter a word that would derogate from the true and proper divinity of Jesus Christ, "very God of very God," and paralyzed be my hand if it were ever stretched forth to snatch the deific crown from the head of Him who is sole and supreme "King of kings and Lord of lords."

Who's Who in Evolution

MORE evidence comes to us every day as to the attitude of evolutionists toward the Bible and the whole Christian system. Let us consider some "modern instances." Dr. Shailer Matthews has come out in a recent pamphlet in favor of evolution; but all of us know that he has aligned himself for many years with the dissecting and rejecting Biblical criticism. A number of years ago he criticised the Nicene Creed, and declared that it was a waste of time for the theologians of that time to wrangle over a word. Afterwards he seemed to modify his view of the Nicene situation, but never came out frankly and honestly with an acknowledgment of his crude error. Well, this liberalist has enlisted in the evolution army.

The same may be said of Harry Emerson Fosdick, of latitudinarian fame. Last March, when the discussion over evolution was at a white heat, Dr. Fosdick came out with an article in favor of evolution and against Mr. Bryan. His article was published in the *New York Times*, and has since been issued by a liberalistic firm in leaflet form, so that it may have as wide a circulation as possible. This advocate of evolution denies the plenary inspiration of the Bible, the virgin birth of Christ, the blood atonement of Christ, and the visible second coming of our Lord and Saviour. It seems that the acceptance of evolution always goes "cheek by jowl" with the rejection of some of the fundamental doctrines of Holy Writ.

In this leaflet Dr. Fosdick assumes the proverbial *aplomb* attitude—we might call it "the strutting attitude," or perhaps "the Peacock attitude"—that "all educated people" believe in evolution. In this very pamphlet he tries to cast discredit on the Bible by representing it as teaching the old Ptolemaic cosmology and other scientific absurdities. Thus his purpose is to show that the Bible is crudely in error regarding science. We think that Dr. Fosdick can be shown to be wrong in his exegesis of the Bible, but our purpose now is not to answer him along this line, but simply to show that every time a man adopts the evolution theory he becomes latitudinarian in his view of the Bible. And yet Prof. Conkling recently came out in a writing in which he accuses evangelical believers of being the chief cause of the

infidelity of the times, especially among "educated" young people!

Here is another index. Practically all infidels today are avowedly on the side of evolution, and that has been the position of infidelity ever since the days of Darwin, Huxley and Spencer. To prove it, I cite Dr. George Henslow's "Present-Day Rationalism Critically Examined," in which he says (p. 17) that "Rationalism and Materialistic Monism" are "professedly based on Darwinism." It must be remembered that what is called Rationalism in England is outright infidelity. Dr. Henslow in the chapter cited gives many quotations from leading British infidels to prove that all of them accept the Darwinian tenets, and always place them over against the teaching of the Bible. In this country the situation is the same. Last spring, when the so-called "theological seventeen" in Columbus, Ohio, came out boldly for evolution, and in consequence rejected some of the major parts of the Bible, the infidel association of that city sang their praises and one of their leaders even proposed to ask one the "seventeen" to deliver an address before a meeting of the infidels. However, those infidels could not lay their tongues and pens to words that were too scoring and vituperative in their condemnation of the evangelical men who came out in defense of the integrity of the Bible.

But here is another straw, and not a small one either. An avowed infidel has just issued a pamphlet against Mr. McCann's recent book on evolution. The brochure has on its title page the imprint of a well-known infidel publishing firm in New York. It is an argument from first to last for evolution, and especially for man's brute origin and descent, and contains throughout a most savage attack on the teaching of the Bible and the Christian church. To prove our statement we cite the following statements, which he quotes with approval from various professors of science: "There are today very few experts in anatomy and zoology who deny the animal descent of man in general." Another says: "In this struggle for intellectual freedom the names of Huxley and Haeckel must be gratefully remembered, since without them Darwin's idea would not have conquered humanity."

Let us remember, Christian people, that Darwin and Huxley were both agnostic respect-

ing God, and that Haeckel was a pronounced materialist and wanted to rid the world of "the three great buttresses of Christianity," the ideas of God, freedom and immortality. This infidel quotes another scientific professor thus . . . "the biologists of every country are agreed that man is an evolved animal, that his lineage can be traced back into the geological past and to an animal pedigree."

We do not know of an infidel today who is not a champion of the evolution of man from a bestial stock. If it were to the point, we should like to inquire why the protagonists of this theory do not want to go to live with their simian relatives. Prof. Conkling, in one of his very last publications, gives the world the uplifting information that "existing apes and monkeys are collateral relatives of man," "his cousins;" then he qualifies it for our comfort by adding, "but not his ancestors." Our point now is that the theologians who advocate evolution ought to know the company into which they put themselves, namely, the infidels, who one and all are the most enthusiastic champions of that hypothesis. We can understand why an infidel might rejoice in a brute ancestry, but it is an engima to us why any one who calls himself a Christian should take any stock or pleasure in such a view.

A fierce infidel recently came out in a tract in favor of evolution. In the same production he made a savage assault on the Bible and Christianity. Sometime we may be able to analyze the whole production and point out its weakness. Just now we wish to call attention to only one vulnerable position that is taken by the author.

In order to cry down man and cry up the animals, especially the baboons, and show that some men are worse than animals, and therefore, of course, that man descended from brute progenitors, he quotes from Felix Oswald, another opponent of Christianity. This writer says that he has seen a female chacma (a South African baboon) nurse and care for a wounded Berber monkey in a very tender and intelligent way. He also saw a "whole tribe of the sympathetic brutes" rush to the rescue of a crippled brother and bear him away in triumph to a place of safety, giving grotesque evidences "of the pride of their hearts or souls." Then he compares this conduct with that of a degraded "Polynesian, who cures his sick children in the smoke house and sells his wife for a glass of grog."

This is intended as a proof of the theory of man's descent from a brute ancestry. What shall be said to those things? We think they constitute several telling counts against the very theory which they are meant to bolster up. One of them is this: Animals are not *immoral*; they simply live out their natural instinctive lives; they are never cruel designedly, but the carnivora simply slay to satisfy their appetites, and kill their prey at once without torture. Neither are animals licentious; there are no venereal diseases among them. This being true, man's moral depravity cannot be his heritage from primitive animalism. You cannot get something out of nothing. If animals are not immoral, then moral depravity could not come from them. If it should be said that man's sin consists in his yielding to his animal passions, we reply that animal passions are not wrong in themselves, not wrong *per se*. It is not the gratification of man's natural instincts that is immoral; it is their perversion. Animals in their natural state never are guilty of such perversion of their instincts. The baboons in Africa followed their native instincts in rescuing their wounded brother. The Polynesian, however, was *immoral*, and therefore worse than the animals. A being with reason and will is the only kind of a being who can be immoral; so man is the only being in this world who can live either a moral or an immoral life.

Again, Dr. Oswald's argument would rather prove that the baboon has descended from man than the reverse. If Oswald thinks that the baboon is so much better than man, and that evolution tends upward, then man came first and Messrs. Baboons came afterward. Why could not this unbeliever see the boomerang in his argument? Or you might put it this way if you like: If man descended from the baboon, and man is so much more degraded than the baboon, then we have a case of devolution instead of evolution. (When the present writer uses the word "devolution," he is using a good dictionary word, which has no connection with the word "devil.")

Still, the case may not be quite so bad as this partisan advocate tries to make us believe. We would kindly ask Dr. Oswald whether the native human tribes of Africa and other countries never nurse and care for their wounded fellows; whether they do not rush to the rescue of a fellow-tribesman who is wounded or in danger; whether they do not show sympathy and love in many ways; and wheth-

er, when such altruistic deeds are done by pagan people, they are not done with far more intelligence than those shown by their brute neighbors. You see, Dr. Oswald has committed the logical fallacy of comparing the most gentle animal species he could find with the worst human specimen he could find. Will our evolutionist friends continue to interpret man by looking to the brutes and the lowest specimens of the human family? For our part we would much rather reason about the origin, worth and destiny of man from such characters as Abraham, Moses, Paul, Luther, Wilberforce, Washington and Lincoln than from looking to a besotted Polynesian "who cures his children in the smoke house and sells his wife for a glass of grog." If *Homo Sapiens* has come up generically from such a degraded source, there is no hope for the human race.

If we had a chance, we should have liked to ask Dr. Oswald whether, when he saw the chacmas (baboons) of Africa, he felt that they were degraded and besotted specimens of their tribe. On the other hand, when he saw the Polynesians of whom he speaks so contemptuously, we feel sure he must have felt that they were degraded human beings. That very intuition proves that down in his soul he

realized that the Polynesians were fallen beings, while the baboons and Berber monkeys were not, but were living their natural, normal lives.

Another thought comes to mind. Why have Dr. Oswald and his coadjutors never sent missionaries to the chamas and monkeys of Africa to enlighten and educate them? They seem to think they are superior to the Polynesians. It might be worth while to try to teach the simians the theory of evolution, so that they might receive its wonderful inspiration, and thus rise in the scale of civilization. If evolutionists are not sending their missionaries out on such work, they certainly are neglecting their duty. The Christian Church, especially the evangelical part of it, is zealous and self-sacrificing in sending missionaries to the Polynesians, and has succeeded in converting thousands and thousands of them, and bringing them to a high state of morality and civilization, which proves that they are human beings capable of salvation and culture. But, for some cause, the church has never thought of sending missionaries to the baboons and apes, not even to the "anthropoid apes." Perhaps they are leaving that beneficent work to the evolutionists!—*L. S. K.*

More Proofs on the Right Side



VERY newly discovered fact that confirms the historicity of the Old Testament is valuable in these testing days. For this reason we rejoice in the appearance of a recent book by that well-known and capable archeologist, Dr. Albert T. Clay, of Yale University. The title of his work is, "A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform." This story was discovered twenty-five years ago, but its significance was not realized until recently, since Dr. Clay gave it most careful and critical examination, and finds what he believes to be indubitable evidence that it is of western, that is, Semitic or Hebrew origin, and not of Babylonian origin. There are traces of Hebrew in a number of the words of the story, which is now in the Accadian dialect.

Now if Dr. Clay's contention can be established—and the evidence he presents is most convincing—it gives the finishing stroke to the pan-Babylonian theory which has been so much in vogue within the last twenty-five years—the theory that everything in ancient times

came from Babylon; that all the stories of the creation and the deluge in the Bible were borrowed from the Babylonian myths and legends. This was the theory championed by Friedrich Delitzsch in his sensational lectures under the title, "Babel und Bibel," in Germany, and which was answered so effectively by Dr. Eduard Koenig in his work, "Bibel und Babel." It was also dealt with sharply by other evangelical scholars.

Dr. Clay does not believe that the Biblical narratives were plagiarized from Babylon, and simply adapted by the Hebrews to their own use and modified by their own ideas. He believes that they are indigenously Hebrew. He took this position in his two previous books, "Amurru" and "The Empire of the Amorites." In this last book he simply furnishes more evidence to establish his previous contention. A reviewer says that this book is attracting the attention of some of the foremost specialists in archeology.

Dr. Clay holds that the Hebrews were indigenous to the land of the Amorites—that is,

the land along the western border of Asia—that they had a culture as ancient as that of Egypt or Babylonia, and that they, along with other Semites, migrated from there to the Euphrates, and carried their culture and civilization with them. Thus we see how Abraham and his family came to be in Ur of the Chaldees at the time of his call.

Dr. Clay has all along maintained that the Biblical patriarchs were actual historical personages. He holds that the antiquity of the Amorite, including of course the Hebrew, civilization is very great, and therefore the contention of liberalists that the culture and religion of Israel were borrowed from the Babylonians has no basis in fact.

In Dr. Clay's last discovery the philological argument for the western and Hebrew origin of this deluge story is very convincing, and there are also a number of geographical *indicia* that lead to the same conclusion.

Thus we need no longer "go to Babylonia to account for the origin of the early stories in the Bible." So says a competent writer in reviewing the book. And what does this signify? That the Old Testament narratives are not mythological, nor the inventions of writers of fiction, but are real history. Thus every new find in archeology seems to confirm our faith in the old Word of God.

Dr. Jastrow, not always so much inclined toward the conservative view, stated publicly, shortly before his death, that he had found proof in another record that the Biblical narratives do not have a Babylonian source. The reasonable view is that the Bible gives the true inspired account of the creation, the deluge and other events in the early history of the world and that the Babylonian stories are traditional corruptions of that account. Accept this view, and how many things are adequately and rationally explained!—L. S. K.

Pertinences from Patton



VALUED exchange gives an interesting report of Dr. Francis L. Patton's recent lecture course on "Fundamental Morality" at Philadelphia, Pa. Although Dr. Patton has almost reached the eighty-year milestone of his useful and inspiring life, yet it appears, from the vigor with which he delivered these addresses on five successive nights, that "his eye is not dimmed nor his natural force abated." Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, of Philadelphia, gives the report of the lectures. He does not always quote directly from Dr. Patton, but gives the gist of many of his incisive remarks. So our quotations of apt sayings are from Dr. Macartney's report.

Of the Darwinian theory of evolution—and its successors—he held that it would not account for the development of the sense of right and wrong; that is, it is not valid nor adequate in the realm of ethics. Even in the physical realm he declared that evolution is only hypothetical. "The theory, therefore, of the natural development of the conscience rests on an unprovable hypothesis, which, in turn, rests on another unprovable hypothesis," said Dr. Patton. "The first lecture," says Dr. Macartney, "concluded with a beautiful tribute to the Bible's compact account of the origin of man and how he came into his moral heritage." Here is a good sentence: "Chris-

tianity is not going to be shunted on to a siding, there to wait while an express train, loaded with a lot of biological excursionists, claim the right of way."

In one lecture he maintained that the external world and our civilization have not moulded and produced man's moral concepts, but man's moral concepts have created our civilization. You see, the evolvers always get the cart in front of the horse; always mistake cause for effect and effect for cause. Some men, Dr. Patton said, speak condescendingly of God and Christianity, as if they had been defeated at the last election. Some people go to a book-store in these materialistic days and inquire for a book on the soul. "None to be had," the book-man says; "the soul is out of date." He also spoke of some preachers today who, after having stripped Christ of the royal garments of his divinity, proceed to decorate him with the gaudy trappings of a minimized theology." And, we would venture to add, how poor and crude and garish are their fallacies!

Much popular preaching today, Dr. Patton thought, has gone far astray in its over-emphasis on the social application of Christianity. To those who overlook the need of individual regeneration, and want to doctor up society *en masse*, he said wittily, "You might as well try to vaccinate the social order." In criti-

cizing the almost exclusive emphasis placed today by certain religionists on the present life to the neglect of the future life, he said: "One man who lives forever is worth a whole generation of men who go down into the dust like the brute."

The grand old man's sturdy faith in the Bible as the Word of God is most exhilarating in these days of a deadly dubeity. He pointed out that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only infallible rule of life and faith. A review of the various assaults on the New Testament down to the very

latest, the "Christ-myth" theory, proved effectively that all of them had met with repulse at the hands of competent evangelical scholars. Thus Dr. Patton has no doubt as to the final issue of the conflict. However, we would add that this is no time to stack arms, and think the victory won without further effort and strenuous defense. We might well say, "eternal vigilance is the price of evangelical truth." Dr. Patton's powerful addresses were taken down by a stenographer, and it is hoped that they will be brought out in book form in the near future.

Did Civilization Evolve from Barbarism?



HAT foremost archeologist, Professor A. H. Sayce, of Oxford University, says it does not. Let us note what he has to say as quoted in a recent number of a contemporary:

"Neither in Egypt nor in Babylonia has any beginning of civilization been found. As far back as archeology can carry us man is already civilized, building cities and temples, carving hard stone into artistic form, and even employing a system of pictorial writing. And of Egypt it may be said that the older the culture the more perfect it is found to be. The fact is a very remarkable one in view of modern theories of development and of the evolution of civilization out of barbarism. Whatever may be the reason, such theories are not borne out by the discoveries of

archeology. Instead of the progress we should expect we find retrogression and decay; where we look for the rude beginnings of art, we find an advanced society and artistic perfection. Is it possible that the Biblical view is right after all, and that civilized man has been civilized from the outset? If so, we can no longer go to the savage to learn how our first ancestors lived and thought, for the savage will represent either degeneracy from a higher type or else a different race. In any case, the culture and civilization of Egypt and Babylonia appear to spring into existence fully developed, as Greek mythology averred that Athene had sprung from the head of Zeus. Archeology, at all events, has failed to discover the elements out of which, according to the doctrine of evolution, they ought to have grown."

Notes and Comments



O often we wonder just what to do with a subscription when it expires. Obviously we do not wish to loose a single subscriber. But neither do we wish a single person to take the CHAMPION unless he feels he is getting his full money's worth—or more than his money's worth. Now, nine out of every ten subscribers resent it if their subscription is interrupted. But we occasionally have our troubles with that tenth person! Strange as it may seem, he will accept every number of the CHAMPION mailed him for a whole year, and more, pays no attention to the several bills we mail him until he receives one calling his attention to the fact that his subscription is overdue. Then he will rise to tell us we

have a perfect right to discontinue the CHAMPION to him when his paid-for subscription expires!! To us it often seems this tenth person intentionally waits to see how long he will get the CHAMPION until he springs this little joke on us! If only we had a way to discover this tenth person! If we had a way we think the miseries of the publisher would vanish—at any rate to a great extent! Do you blame us, then, if we feel just a bit jolly when we get a letter thanking us for continuing? and we get many such letters. We just now opened another such letter. It came while we were again studying this problem. It was from our good friend, Dr. Vaughan, and this is what he wrote: "My subscription to BIBLE CHAMPION expired February, 1922,

and I thank you for sending it on. But the truth is, that my allowing the subscription to drag in that fashion, was inexcusable carelessness. My New Year resolution is to pay up promptly. All of us can do it, if we will, and we are under obligations to do it. I know of no monthly religious magazine that begins to compare with the CHAMPION." I hope the doctor will forgive us for the liberty we take to print his letter here for we know full well it was not sent for such use—we just could not resist the temptation! One \$2.00 subscription wouldn't bother us if it were never paid. It would seem that several thousand friends owing subscriptions think no one but they, individually, owe a subscription! But there are thousands of these individuals who owe us \$2.00, \$4.00, \$6.00; and it is the aggregate of these delinquents that gives us many an anxious hour! If only our friends could appreciate that we are compelled to carry such an aggregation! Will not every one who has not paid his subscription *in advance* step right up and pay it? *Help us* as we are trying to *help you!!!*

WE suppose all of us have our strange experiences! Some are funny, some are serious! Here is one that is both funny and serious! We received our first mail in the new year on the morning of the second day. When we opened the first letter we found in it a request to discontinue the Champion—our good lady is fortunate enough to do a lot of traveling this year. Good excuse and we envy her! The second letter we opened contained a request to discontinue the Champion!?! This good soul must have been "rattled" when he wrote his letter! He should not have written it until he was unrattled again! He took the Champion for one full year, paid for it in advance as all good men should do! He told us he was a broadminded student—he did not specify how broad his mind was! And he wanted us to know in particular that he was an evolutionist! Our bunch is all wrong! Well, now that he has that out of his system we hope he'll feel better! The third letter we opened was a request to discontinue—he had a distressing time of it the last year and must economize and sacrifice. His letter convinced us we must extend his subscription one year and charge it up to the Champion's deficit! All this looked ominous to us and we hesitated to open the fourth letter for we saw by the printed envelope that

it came from a Counsellor at Law, at Washington! After we could grasp what he really did say in his letter we heaved a great big sigh of relief, for this is what he said: "The Champion is the most interesting and the best magazine I have ever read." This soothed our poor nerves a bit, for surely a lawyer *must* know what he is talking about! We now felt the tide had turned, and we opened the fifth letter. This brought back all the old-time optimism! It was from our old friend, Dr. MacNicholl. We print this letter in full elsewhere in this number for we know it will do your soul good to read it! You can perhaps not appreciate how glad we are to get nice letters! There is so much to discourage! Well, there were no more requests to discontinue in that mail, but a lot of renewals, and quite a few sent new subscriptions with their renewals! For these, and all other new subscriptions received from our friends we are duly grateful! But wasn't it strange to open up, those five letters in the order given above and on the first working day of the year!

A HELPFUL writer says: "Theoretically the hardships of life are undesirable. Practically they are the making of the soul. When Dante undertook to climb the sunlit hill, his way was challenged by a host of unexpected enemies. It has always been so: there is no reaching the summit of the sunlit hill without overcoming."

IN the very forefront of world-encircling effection evangelists and as a successful teacher multitudes of young men and women preparing them for evangelistic labor and other forms of Christian-service, stands R. A. Torrey, now at the head of the Los Angeles Bible Institute. He has written many valuable books, among them the masterly theological treatise, *What the Bible Teaches*. In view of the frequent theological perversions and aversions, the manifold theological deficiencies and requirements we have observed in *The Christian Century*, we had thought of recommending this treatise to the editor of that journal; but we see it would likely do no good, for in an editorial in the issue of Aug. 31, it is said: "Dean Torrey has made a great many addresses and has undoubtedly said many things that he has forgotten. Indeed, most of what he says is better forgotten." This last sentence is an illuminating self-exposure of *The Century*. We know where to place it now.

PROFESSOR EMIL E. FISCHER, D.D., of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, offers some remarks in a recent article that are worth pondering: "Manifestly modernism offers no constructive solution of the problem which it itself raises. If an adjustment of Christianity to the new learning becomes necessary, it will be made gradually, without the sacrifice of any cardinal doctrine. There have been other periods in the history of the Church when the chasm between faith and the cultural tendencies seemed to yawn wide and ominously. But they were not bridged by an ignominious surrender on the part of the Church. Rather did the Church appropriate for the enrichment of her own life whatever of new truth was brought to light, always careful, however, to conserve her own peculiar heritage. It will not be otherwise in the future. . . The modernist who is shouting, 'The Church is dead; long live the Church! has need of self-restraint. He is anticipating, and the facts may prove embarrassing. The time for a new coronation has not yet arrived.

THE digging of the Panama Canal was the result of a dauntless purpose that knew no such word as failure. After it was completed, one of the workers wrote these lines, which ought to put new iron into men's blood and give tonality to their lives:

"Got any rivers that are uncrossable?
Got any mountains you can't tunnel through?
We specialize on the wholly impossible,
Doing the things that no one could do!"

THE tip of the spire of the First Methodist Episcopal Church Temple, in Chicago, will be 561 feet from the ground, making this the highest church building in the world.

MANY of the advocates of social science, new theology and theological reconstruction seem to be very much afraid that Christian people will think so much of the next world, that they will neglect the affairs of the present world. They hardly need to worry themselves on that score. We should very much like to meet a person who was too heavenly minded. He surely would be a *rara avis*. In fifty years and more of close observation of people, including ministers, we cannot remember having met a single one who was too heavenly minded. We have met hundreds who were too worldly minded. So all these admonitions seem to be superfluous. It is

much to be feared that the champions of the "new" views are engaged in the needless occupation of setting up men of straw and then seeing how cleverly they can demolish them.

IN these days of human self-sufficiency, it is well for men to remember a few important facts. Sometimes men think they do everything and God does nothing; then they plume themselves with pride and forget to thank their Maker and Preserver. In reproof of such pride and neglect a pithy writer says of man: "He is only a contributing factor to the events that occur as the result of his action. For instance, some one has calculated that in the making of a crop man furnishes only *five* per cent. of the energy and God *ninety-five* per cent." Yet there are people who "have not God in all their thoughts."

THE Indians on the Catteraugus Reservation wanted a building in which to worship God, and the Disciples of New York organized a congregation, which built a church in one day. The cost of the church was \$3,000. Most of the labor was contributed. On the day of dedication three girls of the Seneca tribe were baptized in the river, and in the afternoon there was a wedding with a Christian ceremony.

IN the Scofield Bible, the great faith chapter, Hebrews xi, has a footnote (6.1302), which so clearly and so satisfactorily defines faith and describes its uses, that we are glad to pass it on. "The essence of faith consists in receiving what God has revealed, and may be defined as that trust in the God of the Scriptures and in Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, which receives Him as Saviour and Lord, and impels to loving obedience and good works (John i. 12; Jas. ii. 14-22). The particular *uses* of faith give rise to its secondary definitions: (1) For salvation, faith is personal trust, apart from meritorious works, in the Lord Jesus Christ, as delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification (Rom. iv. 5:23-25). (2) As used in prayer, faith is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us' (John v. 14,15). (3) As used in reference to unseen things of which Scripture speaks, faith 'gives substance' to them, so that we act upon the conviction of their reality (Heb. vi. 1-3). (4) As a working principle in life, the uses of faith are illustrated in Heb. xi. 1-39."

UNOFFICIAL Methodist journals are voicing their protest against "Modernism." The American Methodist League seeks to organize northern and southern Methodists into a group. Its officials are: Rev. H. C. Morrison, Louisville, Ky., president; Rev. W. C. Nixon, Detroit, Mich., vice president; Rev. G. W. Ridout, Wilmore, Ky., corresponding secretary; C. C. Valade, Detroit, Mich., treasurer. The following is a statement of principles: "Methodists who dance, play cards, attend theatres and horse races, are not eligible to membership in this league. It is the purpose of this league to propagate and defend the original doctrines of Methodism and to oppose the desecration of the Methodist church buildings by turning them into show houses and places of amusement and play. The Methodist league will vigorously oppose destructive criticism of the holy Bible in its various forms, but especially in Methodist pulpits, schools and literature."

IN the Czecho-Slovakian National Church there is a split between the orthodox group and the one of modernist tendencies. The patriarch-elect of the Czecho-Slovakian National church, Dr. Farsky, is reported as having drafted a catechism for the sect which says that "God is the living law of nature" "Jesus is one of the men prominent in the religious education of mankind." The orthodox bishop of Serbia refused to recognize the church so long as it held to this catechism.

IN these Sadducean days some people are talking about an "expurgated Bible." It would seem to us to be more apropos to think and talk about an expurgated heart—a heart expurgated from the sin of pride and prejudice.

IN learning to read children usually emphasize all the words of a sentence alike, or else put the chief stress on the last word, even though it may be a small and comparatively unimportant word. By and by they learn to read according to the sense, and then they put the main emphasis on the most important words. However, in reading the sentence of life so many people continue to be like children just learning to read; they emphasize the less important matters, the material, the temporal, the merely pleasure-giving, and put little stress upon the things that are vital, character-forming, destiny-making. They reverse our Lord's command about seeking

first the kingdom of God, and so seek first "the other things."

CATHOLICS are now well organized at State Universities. The first Catholic work at a state university was begun less than twenty years ago, but the work has now so advanced that few institutions do not have a Catholic club, or a Catholic student pastor. Forty-eight colleges and universities in the United States have 130,000 students of which one-tenth are Catholics. Catholic clubs have enrolled seventy-one per cent of these students. Newman clubs are the favorite method of organization. In many cases the Knights of Columbus have provided a club house for students. The situation is thus summarized: "Full-time chaplains are stationed at the University of Wisconsin, University of California, Colorado State Teachers' College, University of Illinois, University of Michigan, Stevens Institute of Technology, Columbia University and Barnard College, University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State College, University of Texas, University of Florida, and Yale University. Part-time chaplains are connected with twenty-one of the clubs. The Catholic chaplains give courses of study in religious subjects for which university and college credit is given in the University of Illinois, Columbia University, Barnard College, University of Texas, and the University of Florida."

MANY modern people are very much concerned to know what men think of God. Is it not much more important to inquire what God thinks of men? "Every way of a man is right in his own eyes; but Jehovah weigheth the hearts."

THE young men of Kingshighway Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, installed a broadcasting outfit, and both the morning and evening services are sent out. Keen interest is taken in it by many who never attended divine worship.

IN reviewing a recent liberalistic book, Dr. John A. W. Haas, president of Muhlenberg College, makes the following pertinent observations: "There must be a frank acceptance of the supernatural if religion is to remain religion and not be lost in the mazes of philosophy. The spirit of this book, like so many of the later treatises of this kind, is

the modern spirit of self-confidence by which man makes his own God, and does not in humility of mind receive the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. No philosophy, useful as it is in its place, can be a substitute for the vital religious experience in which God comes to us through His truth in Christ." That says it, and says it truly. After all, much of the so-styled "modern mind" is simply the old pride of the "old man."

JULIUS ROSENWALD, of Chicago, is giving one-tenth of the amount necessary to erect a colored Y. M. C. A. building in Pittsburgh. It is to provide a gymnasium, swimming pool, shower baths, dormitories, restaurant, boys' department, social hall, and quarters for religious work. The Masonic order had charge of the cornerstone ceremonies.

AN exchange prints an interesting bit of news! It tells us a minister in Pittsburg, "an avowed liberal, combines modern thinking with evangelistic passion." A wonderful combination! Wonder how he does it! The

announcement says lots about what he believes, but not one word about what he achieves.

ON May 6, 1923, the young people of various churches of the Presbyterian denomination will be called upon to think on the investment of their lives in some great cause, and the Presbyterian Board of Education is offering \$100.00 for the best pageant suitable for Vocation day. A committee appointed will judge the various offerings which are made in the competition.

ROWEN, ILL., with a population of 715 has a church membership of 400, not taking into account the 300 members living in the outskirts of the town, nor the 300 non-resident members on the rolls of the three churches in the town. The three Sunday Schools have a total enrollment of 600 members with 300 members on the home department roll. The regular attendance on Sunday School in the three schools frequently reaches a total of more than 500.

A Splendid Tribute by a Father in Israel

I HEREWITH enclose you check for my renewal subscription for current year. I keenly regret I cannot send you a hundred dollars to help place the *Champion* in the hands of fifty college students, many of whom are being twisted, intellectually, and not helped much ethically, by the evolutionary and materialistic philosophy with which they are being fed by professors who, I fear, know little, experimentally, about God, and are attempting to make unwarrantable theories a substitute for facts.

Every issue of the *Bible Champion* seems better than any of its predecessors. Your editorial staff is made up of splendid men, who unite advanced scholarship and spirituality. Their pens, though dipped in honey, are keen as Damascus blades. Their exegesis of the Word is illuminating and inspiring. They unveil the trickery of the enemy, and shatter his arguments with their invincible logic. With convincing clearness and force they show that the Word of the Lord still rests securely on its immutable foundations.

I never rise from the reading of the *Champion* without having both mind and heart profoundly stirred; and I thank the Lord that in this age of reckless speculation when men, blinded by pride of intellect, are "handling the Word of God deceitfully," the dear old Bible has defenders of such fine ability, and excellent spirit.

God bless you, my dear brother, in your great work. The distance to the heavenly city for your humble servant is growing shorter; and I rejoice that after a ministry of forty-six years I believe unshakably that the Gospel of Christ is still the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and will finally and eternally prevail over all opposition.

I am constrained to write these sentiments out of the fullness of my heart. A good old-fashioned hallelujah that David is today laying Goliath in the dust. The Lord be with thee and thine, thou mighty man of valor!—*W. MacNicholl, D.D.*

THE ARENA

The Riddle of Spiritism

By Professor Luther T. Townsend, D.D., LL.D., Brookline, Massachusetts

III Opinions Stated and Discussed



HAT we have been saying naturally leads to an investigation of the grounds upon which the opinions of eminent men of science and philosophy, also the opinions of men and women of high literary standing, regarding the spirit-world, are based. While looking up the literature on the subject, the author has felt a keen surprise at the number of persons of high standing who have been willing to stand as sponsors for medium spiritism.

In Great Britain, names that readily occur to one are those of Sir Oliver Lodge, Arthur Balfour, regarded as one of the finest minds in Great Britain, who insists that science cannot explain the wonders he had seen; Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, author of *Sherlock Holmes*; William T. Stead, founder and editor of the *Review of Reviews*; Professor Sidgwick, of Cambridge University, and his celebrated associate, F. W. H. Myers, poet and eminent classical scholar; Sir William Crooks, Alfred Russell Wallace, Archdeacon Wilberforce, Sir Wm. Barrett, and Mrs. Sidgwick.

Among the French Spiritists are found Camille Flammarion, the astronomer, who ranks among the most distinguished in his profession; Dr. Pierre Janet, professor of psychology, of the College of France; Professor Charles Richet, of the Paris Faculty of Medicine; Dr. Maxwell of Bordeaux, Count Agenor de Gasparin of Paris, who after testing Spiritism with the distinguished physician, M. Thury, of the University of Geneva, became convinced of the presence and operation of an unknown psychic force; L. H. D. Rivail, who taught the doctrine of successive reincarnation with intervals of spirit life; Bergson, Geley, and Mme. Bisson.

Italy furnishes the names of Professors Schiaparelli, Mosselli, and Lombroso. Among German spiritists, Professor Max Dezzio, who perhaps ranks the highest, as does Professor Flournoy in Switzerland, Professors Malta

and Van Zelst in Holland, Atsakoff in Russia, and Reichenbach in Austria.

Among Americans the prominent names are Dr. Richard Hodgson, described as "the keenest psychic detective the world ever knew," who exposed Mme. Blavatsky and many others, but who, after 18 years' research, accepted without reserve the spiritistic theory.

Other American names familiar in Spiritistic literature are those of the late Professor James H. Hyslop, of Columbia University; the Rev. Heber Newton, Judge Edmunds, and Professor Hare of the University of Pennsylvania, one of our country's leading chemists, Prof. James, of Harvard, and several others whose names will appear further on in the discussion.

These names are sufficient, however, to justify a statement that appeared not long since in the *New York Sun*.

The earnest testimony of such men is not to be rejected offhand and will not be while mankind is carrying its present burden of sorrow. Their emphatic assertions that there does exist evidence of the physical phenomena of Spiritism deserves consideration and is receiving it.

Conan Doyle puts the argument based upon numbers much stronger in his latest book, *The Vital Message*:

It is possible to write down the names of 50 professors in great seats of learning who have examined and endorsed these facts, and the list would include many of the greatest intellects that the world has produced in our time. I have never in my 30 years of experience known one single scientific man who went thoroughly into this matter and did not end by accepting the spiritual solution.

This closing sentence is a surprise and shows that Conan Doyle needs to enlarge his circle of acquaintances. Still, there is no question that the time has passed when any thoughtful man will cast this subject aside with a sneer. Its standing and support are such that even a more careful consideration is called for than many, if not most, of those opposed to spiritism have been in the habit of giving it.

Now, therefore, what is it that has convinced these distinguished investigators that Spiritism

all that has been claimed for it and that the phenomena presented cannot be explained by any scientific methods that thus far have been employed?

The course of procedure that would seem to commend itself to any candid person, and the one we adopt, is this: to examine the statements made by some of the more noted advocates of medium Spiritism, and then from these statements infer whether the theory is entitled to the consideration that has been given it.

Sir Oliver Lodge may, as well as anyone else, be taken as a representative of the more recent scientific Spiritists. As is well known, he does not hesitate to affirm that the phenomena of Spiritism are produced by the spirits of the departed who are trying to break through the barriers between the living and the dead that they may comfort our hearts and assure our minds that there is an immortal life and enlighten us concerning the things of an unseen world.

In a lecture in London before coming to this country Sir Oliver made this statement:

I know that certain friends of mine still exist, because I have talked to them. Communication is possible. One must obey the laws and find out the conditions. I do not say it is easy, but I say it is possible, and I have conversed with them as I could now converse with any one in this audience.

It is perhaps needless to say that we have for this distinguished scientist very high esteem in view of his knowledge and discussions of ether and the atom, and he also has our sincere sympathy on account of the death of his son, Raymond, that no doubt has had much to do in establishing his belief in Spiritism. But when he speaks of these recent revelations of Spiritism as a "new gospel" one feels that he is not well informed as to the history of the subject. Nor need there be any hesitation in saying that he failed in his attempted support of medium Spiritism in his recent lectures on that subject. He had a rare opportunity. The great auditorium of Carnegie Hall, seating about 3,500 people, was crowded with an expectant audience. We had looked for scientific evidence of his theory, and we had a right to count on it, because of his standing as a scientist; but what he said was keenly disappointing, unsatisfactory, unscientific, misleading, and unscriptural, and we are quite sure that all intelligent Spiritists have felt much the same way. They certainly had a right to look to him for a strong scientific defence in support of their views and claims, but, as we

have said, his lectures were anything but convincing.

The majority of thinking people will agree with the opinion of President Stanley Hall, who, after studying spirit phenomena with considerable care, and having himself, with what he calls "clumsy performances," duplicated some of the Spiritists' most surprising exhibitions, and "deceived the most exacting of his spectators," insists that Sir Oliver Lodge is not mentally qualified to instruct the world on these subjects.

The fact is that Sir Oliver Lodge is a materialistic scientist and not a spiritualistic philosopher, and any man, outside of his own field of investigation, may have the simplicity of a child. "The shoemaker," as Emerson has said, "cannot work beyond his last."

Another thing that is against Sir Oliver's reputation is the fact that the trans-utterances of Mrs. Leonora F. Piper afforded primarily, if not largely, the data upon which our distinguished English scientist based his belief in Spiritism. A few words, therefore, concerning Mrs. Piper will not be out of place. Her home has been in Arlington, Mass. She may almost be said to have been for many years a neighbor of the author. After a somewhat brief career in Boston and vicinity, where the author saw some of her exhibitions, and after attracting the attention of such men as Professor James, Dr. Hyslop, and Dr. Hodgson, founder of the American Society for Psychical Research, she was sent abroad and was received in England by Sir Oliver Lodge and entertained by one of his friends, Mr. Myers, a Spiritist and a man of high literary and social standing. From the start she appears to have been a puzzle to several scientific men of note, who were supposed to be very shrewd investigators. Later Mrs. Piper returned to this country, and after working her craft for a while retired for a time to private life; but at last accounts is again in England and is said to be a subject there of continued investigation and study.

It is generally conceded that Mrs. Piper is an honest woman to the extent of believing that she has been in communication with the spirits of the dead. At the outset she thought that a deceased French physician bearing the odd name of Phinuit was her informer, or secondary—that is the medium between herself and the invisible world. Later a personage by the name of George Pelham displaced Dr. Phinuit as her medium of communication.

Now, for the moment admitting the honesty of Mrs. Piper, the question that follows is this: How did she produce the phenomena that have puzzled the scientific men who have been investigating them and that convinced Sir Oliver Lodge that he could converse with his son Raymond?

Very naturally, any one who doubts the presence and agency of the spirits of the dead in this world, and who does not believe that Mrs. Piper resorted to trickery, would say that she employed telepathic agencies, by which is meant the transmission of the thoughts, desires, feelings, and images from one mind to another with no ordinary or recognized channel of communication, or that she herself is a subject of hypnotism, which is a kind of mesmeric sleep in which things could be made known, be seen and firmly believed, that really have no existence, and that while in this abnormal mental condition striking phenomena might follow that would be very difficult of explanation.

But whatever help Mrs. Piper may have received from telepathy, or from the influence of mind over mind among living persons, or from an ability to explore the subconsciousness of those who had been sitting near her, or from some other as yet inexplicable agency, this is to be said, that all or nearly all of her exhibitions during her visit in England were duplicated by far less noted persons than herself. Miss Agnus, well known in England as a crystal gazer, was reported by Andrew Lang to have equalled Mrs. Piper's exhibitions, and, as he puts the case, "with no aid from the dead." Mrs. Piper's complete failure in the Connors case is well known. And Professor James once made this statement: "To my mind Mrs. Piper's trace-impersonation of the departed Gurney had not the slightest inner verisimilitude." Dr. Walker Leaf is of the opinion that Mrs. Piper's supposed spirit control is merely a name for Mrs. Piper's "secondary personality," and Professor MacAlister, the noted anatomist, said of Mrs. Piper: "She is not anesthetic during the so-called trance, and if you ask my private opinion, it is that the whole thing is an imposture, and a poor one at that." In speaking of his experience with Mrs. Piper, Dr. Carrington says, in his report to the Society for Psychical Research:

I gained the distinct impression throughout the sitting that instead of the spirits of the personages who claimed to be present, I was dealing with an

exceedingly sly, cunning, tricky, and deceitful intelligence. . . . If anything could make me believe in the doctrine of evil and lying spirits it would be the sittings with Mrs. Piper. I do not for one moment implicate the normal Mrs. Piper in this criticism.

The author's opinion, based upon not a very extended acquaintance with Mrs. Piper, is that her success has depended quite largely on her skill in reading facial expressions, in a shrewdness in guessing; in her naive way of eliciting replies to her questions; in her handling of hints obtained from those attending her seances with a possible, perhaps with a probable, use of telepathy or some other as yet unknown agency, from which, however, we are inclined to eliminate everything pertaining to the spirits of the dead.

When, therefore, Sir Oliver allows such questionable authority as Mrs. Piper to contribute largely in the formation of his belief in Spiritism he would seem to have lost, in a measure at least, his scientific poise.

Two other mediums who have been consulted by Sir Oliver are Mrs. Leonard, whose intermediary was named Feda, and a Mr. Peters, whose intermediary bore the singular name Moonstone.

We confine attention for a moment to the revelations that were received from Sir Oliver's son Raymond, partly through the little Indian maiden, Feda, and partly through the other medium, Mrs. Leonard.

Raymond told his father that he was living in a brick house, and when asked as to the composition of the bricks, Feda replied:

That's what he hasn't found out yet. He is told by some, who he doesn't think would lead him astray, that they are made from sort of emanations from the earth. He says there's something rising, like atoms rising, and we concentrate them. I mean those that are not solid when they come, but we can collect and concentrate them—I mean those that are with me. They appear to be bricks, and when I touch them they feel like bricks; and I have seen granite too.

But there are other equally interesting and surprising conversations between Raymond and his father through the intermediaries, the Indian maiden, Feda, and Mr. Moonstone. The following for instance:

All the decay that goes on on the earth-plane is not lost: it gives off an essence or gas which ascends and becomes what you call a smell, and from that smell we are able to produce duplicates of whatever form the thing had before it became a smell. You can understand how all this interests me. . . . Different kinds of cloth give off different kinds of

smells. Apparently, as far as I can gather, the rotting wool appears to be used for making things like tweeds on our side. But I know I'm jumping, I'm guessing at it. My suit I expect was made from decayed worsted on your side. You know flowers, how they decay. We have got flowers here; your decayed flowers flower again with us—beautiful flowers.

Speaking through the Indian maiden and Mrs. Leonard, Raymond tells his father that they make on the other side what answers to cigars, but that after a few whiffs smokers do not care to smoke any more. He tells his father that they make whiskey sodas for those who call for them, but a few drinks suffice and the toper becomes a teetotaler.

Now, our point is this: that if Sir Oliver Lodge really believes, and he certainly seems to, that these spook revelations are the talk of his son, who had the reputation of being an intelligent youth when on earth, then Sir Oliver's mind on the subject of Spiritism is unbalanced and he is not qualified to instruct the public on that subject however sane he may be in the field of physical science, and we hope to be pardoned for saying that if Sir Oliver continues his consultations with Feda and Mr. Moonstone, and his use of the ouija board long enough, there will be a complete mental disaster the same as there has been in case of thousands of others.

The limitations of our discussion will allow a statement of the opinions and experiences of only a few others who have written on the subject and who have confidence that the dead can communicate with the living through the agency of spirit mediums.

But for those who wish to make an exhaustive study of the subject the following publications, of easy access, will be found of interest: *The Open Vision*, by Horatio W. Dressor; *Contact With the Other World*, and *Life After Death*, by James H. Hislop; *The Seven Purposes*, by Margaret Cameron; *On the Threshold of the Unseen*, by William F. Barrett; *Proofs of the Spirit World*, by L. Chevreuil; *Meslom's Messages from the Life Beyond*, by Mary A. McEvilly; *Our Unseen Guests*, by an anonymous author; *The Modern Claims of the Possession of Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, Stated and Examined*, by Professor Hatchards; *Pagan Idolatry*, by G. Stanley Fabar; *Letters from Julia*, by W. T. Stead; *Letters from a Living Dead Man*, by Elsa Baker.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle has this to say of what has been called "the five most popular

and serious volumes on Spiritualism: "If no other spiritual books were in existence, those five alone would, in my opinion, be sufficient to establish the facts for any reasonable inquirer." The five books named are the following: *Raymond*, by Sir Oliver Lodge; *Psychical Investigation*, by Arthur Hill; *Reality of Psychical Phenomena*, by Professor Crawford; *Threshold of the Unseen*, by Professor Sir William Barrett and *Ear of Dionysius*, by Gerald Balfour. Aside from the foregoing books there are interesting and instructive articles in *The Westminster Review*, *The British Quarterly*, and in *The Quarterly Journal of Science*, for the year 1875, and besides the reviews and quarterlies there are the reports of the British and American "Societies for Psychical Research" that would fill several volumes. Two or three other publications will be referred to and quoted a little later.

We have taken Sir Oliver Lodge as the representative of scientific writers. We hope the selection will not be regarded as at all unfair.

And now, in selecting Basil King to represent the literary fraternity we may not have made the wisest choice, but this is to be said in justification of the selection, that Mr. King has written several books that have received favorable notice, and his book entitled *The Abolishing of Death* is one of the latest publications on the subject of Spiritism, and is the one that now claims our attention. It will be noticed in the opening of the book that Mr. King proposes to give his readers what are claimed to be facts, without, however, attempting an explanation of them. Indeed, he positively declines to offer explanations. He tells his readers that formerly he had been skeptical as to the entire subject of Spiritism, but later had been convinced that it is true. His conviction was based largely upon the pencil writing of Margaret Cameron, author of *The Seven Purposes*.

The rapidity of the pencil movement, the diction and rhetorical expression of the medium could not be accounted for by Mr. King except upon the supposition that Miss Cameron was aided by some invisible but intelligent spirit agency. Such was his conversion from skepticism to a belief in Spiritism.

The fact, however, should not be overlooked, and should be passed to the credit of Mr. King that he continued to hold the Bible in high esteem and revered the name and person of Jesus Christ, which can be said of only a few Spiritists. He also says many things that may well

receive one's approval. But, on the other hand, it is found that his writings abound in much imaginative material that from our point of view has neither scientific, philosophical, psychological, nor a theological basis.

A rather fascinating interest from start to finish gathers about a young woman whom Mr. King names Jennifer, who had been an acquaintance of his of long standing. On a certain day, while in his presence, and while they both were witnessing the pencil writing of Margaret Cameron, this young friend, Miss Jennifer, was suddenly impressed with the thought that she, too, could use the pencil and upon trying was able to do so. She then became Mr. King's "transmitter" or "link between the two spheres, the plane on which we live and the plane just next above;" in other words, a link between the world of "the so-called living" and "the so-called dead."

Not long after the beginning of her pencil-writing a personage who belonged to "the plane just next above," to whom Mr. King gave the name Henry Talbot, who, when living, was a noted chemist, became the chief correspondent in the automatic writing of Miss Jennifer. Several attempts had been made before Mr. Talbot secured this position. Subsequently, while speaking of Miss Jennifer, Mr. Talbot says, "She is a loved and loving transmitter." He seems to have been very fond of her and perhaps was in love with her. At least, they worked together in the greatest possible harmony while in communication with Mr. King.

As would be expected, Mr. King asked many different questions and some difficult ones, but Mr. Talbot, the dead and invisible chemist, answered them almost always without a moment's hesitation by means of the pencil writing of Miss Jennifer.

Much to our surprise, Mr. Talbot, on the plane above, is opposed to all mediums except those that use the pencil. While urging every one to get into communication with those on the plane where he is, he adds with emphasis, "But do not go to mediums." That certainly is good advice even if it comes from a dead chemist. Elsewhere Mr. Talbot uses these words: "I oppose seances, but I do not oppose the desire to communicate." What he calls "thought exchange," in spirit communication, he ranks as first in importance, and pencil, or automatic writing, as second. Other methods of spirit communication he regards altogether questionable.

It also appears to be the opinion of the dead chemist that there are not many trustworthy communicators, the most important and reliable ones being himself, of course, then Raymond Lodge, Frederick Gaylord, a Detroit young man who is introduced in *The Seven Purposes*, by Margaret Cameron, already referred to, and a young Harvard law professor named Ernest, who died thirty years ago, and who on being asked by Mr. King as to employments on the plane above replied that he was "hoping to write books on law."

A further review of Mr. King's book makes it clear that there is nothing in it that cannot be easily accounted for without the help of the dead chemist or that of any other personage who lives in the other world. Henry Talbot, as he impresses us, is only an imaginary character, who says nothing that in substance has not been said over and over again. We would not imply that Mr. King is dishonest in what he writes, or that he intentionally would deceive his readers, but that he is self deceived, and that his spirit revelations are largely, if not entirely, subjective. One of the first things a literary critic notices is this: that the diction and rhetorical style of Mr. King, the diction and style of Miss Jennifer, the transmitter, and the diction and style of Henry Talbot, the dead chemist, are nearly the same, and were it not for quotation marks one could not tell who is the speaker. More than once we took a look backward to make sure whether it were Mr. King, or Mr. Talbot, or Miss Jennifer that had been speaking.

The second criticism we make is that the teaching of Mr. King's book as to the spirit world is both unscriptural and unsafe. The teaching is scarcely at all different from the false and misleading teachings of Christian Science. Indeed, it is very much like it. Henry Talbot, for instance, is asked this question: "If evil in man is not carried over to the next plane what becomes of it?" His answer is a quotation from Browning's "Abt Vogler": "The evil is null, is naught, drops into nullity and nothingness."

The difference between goodness and badness is said by Mr. Talbot to be "different degrees of spirit." Sin is represented not as a reality but a "blank." The only hell there is "is the abuse of motive power," if one can tell what that means. Those who go to Mr. Talbot's hell are treated with "special love and favor." There is on the plane just above what may be called sorrow or remorse, but the pro-

visions against it are overwhelming, and without delay an abundance of joy takes the place of sorrow and remorse. Those who enter the world above "unprepared" suffer from "handicaps" for a while but are treated with special favor. The arrival in the next world is sometimes "bewildering," especially in case of one who is suddenly called there by accident or otherwise, but none "is ever destitute of joy." What little anguish there may be is not from disobedience to God and the rejection of Christ but is in consequence of "having ignored so much of love and beauty." One is, therefore, inclined to ask, What stronger invitation or temptation to kill oneself could come to one who is in distress than the assurance of meeting on the threshold of the plane above "the spirit of joy"? And if this is true, why hold back a bereaved, a disappointed, or an over-weary man or woman when standing on the river brink, or when stretching out the hand for poison or pistol?

The following is a specimen of the spiritistic theology announced by the transmitter to Mr. King:

The greatest sinner has a right to enter heaven, as it is his Father's house where are many mansions. He is received with a tenderness for which we have no terms. He enters not as a recipient of celestial alms but as an heir, entitled to all that heaven can bestow. Every sinner has the sensation of being engulfed at once in perfect love. . . . There are no evil spirits.

This theology of Mr. Talbot, that apparently is approved by Mr. King, belongs to a past age. It is essentially "the death and glory" theory of Hosea Ballou, the father of American Universalism, announced in 1770, the meaning of which is that when a man dies, be he saint or sinner, he at once enters into glory. Later, however, the question put by the Channing Unitarians to the Ballou Universalists was this: "Can the passage through the doorway of death of itself change completely and fit for heaven the character of a reprobate?" That question and the reasoning that led up to it, or down from it, wrought such havoc with the Ballou belief that it was quite soon generally abandoned; and today no thoughtful Universalist holds the theory of death and glory, though Christian Scientists and Spiritists are attempting to revive it.

Now, when recalling the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ and other teachings of the Bible and those of a sane philosophy and of a rational psychology, we are led to say that

Henry Talbot has reported to Mr. King precisely what demons would have him say and presumably precisely what Mr. King himself believes.

The purpose we have in mind does not make it necessary to review at length other books and teachings of Spiritists, with the exception of two or three that are representative of a multitude of similar ones.

An English lady "of high standing and of marked refinement," who had been strongly opposed to Spiritism, was bereft of her husband. She was induced to take up automatic writing. After two months she became a believer and operator. The following revelations made to her were reported in the *Weekly Dispatch*, London:

I have received long letters from my husband telling of his experience in heaven on the Second Plane. Finally in describing his garden, he grew a flower and since then many others. Some of them may grow in this world, but I have never seen them.

My husband comes to me three times a day, at 8:30 a.m., 12:30 noon, and 6:30 in the evening. He tells me quite a lot about the other world, where people seem to live very much as they do on earth, excepting that everyone is happy and everything is bright.

Heaven, according to my husband, is a city of golden gates, as the Bible tells me. The buildings are of white marble and shine like crystal. The people there wear long white garments, but they may choose a sort of variation. My husband wears a gold circlet, which was given to him as a reward for unselfish nature. He was the most unselfish man on earth.

His mother met him when he passed over and they now live together, and he has also with him his two favorite dogs, which he tells me seem quite young again. After reaching heaven my husband slept for two months.

There is no such thing as day and night. Sometimes the light seems shaded, but only for a time. The people do not eat except occasionally a little fruit.

There is no work as we know it. What they do is more like pleasure. On the Second Plane, where my husband lives, he tells me there are some wonderful inland lakes, in which he intended to keep goldfish.

My husband has met our old coachman, who died two months after him. On earth the coachman was very fond of his beer, and was very disappointed when he was told there was no beer in heaven. Anyhow he was given something which tasted very much like beer and he was quite satisfied.

Those who wish to smoke can do so. My husband was a very heavy smoker on earth. Tobacco is prepared on the Second Plane, but he does not care for the preparation and does not smoke, neither does the coachman. New arrivals always express a desire to smoke, but the craving soon leaves them.

Once a week large sports are held for the young people, soldiers, and any one who likes to join in. The sports are like Greek games—running, jumping and everything to show skill. There is also some kind of shooting at colored balls thrown high in the air.

After the sports a concert is held. No one is obliged to sing unless he wants to. The people are very much like they are on earth, only they look younger and they are nicer. He tells me that, although he can float through anything on earth he feels quite solid to himself, but lighter, better, brighter and much younger. He looks about thirty, ten years younger than he was on earth.

At first thought it seems incredible that "an intelligent English woman of high standing" would so lose her good sense while dabbling with automatic writing as to believe that these revelations are from her dead husband. But it is so, nevertheless, and not only is it so in case of this woman but in that of ten thousand others. And this woman, as we presently shall see, has taken only one of the preliminary steps downward, and if she continues to toy with automatic spirit-writing the end is likely to be infidelity or insanity.

A book entitled *A Cloud of Witnesses*, by Mrs. Anna de Koven, published May, 1920, had been extensively advertised, with assurances that remarkable revelations would be made. With no little interest we awaited its publication. The introduction, which was found to be entertaining reading, was written by Dr. Hyslop. A Mrs. Vernon is the principal medium consulted, though a Black Hawk Canadian Indian is also occasionally introduced. The communications from the other world are chiefly from Mrs. de Koven's sister, though her father and mother are also consulted. Some of "the spirit tests" were made in New York City, at the home of Mrs. Vernon, others in Boston, at the Copley Plaza, and at a few other places. Mrs. de Koven often made use of the ouija board when communicating with her dead sister. The descriptions of the world beyond are such that one is led to infer that either Mrs. de Koven or her sister or Mrs. Vernon, the medium, had been familiar with the writings of Paul and the visions of the Apostle John. Rom. 1:20 and Rev. 21 and 22.

The dead sister, through the medium, gives this information as to what she has seen:

"There are cities infinitely more attractive and beautiful than any on earth;" "there is a home or house for 'transients,' a sort of a hospital for homesick souls;" "there are books for those who wish to read;" "the food is a sort of flaky stuff like snow;" people have

spiritual bodies that are made of ether;" "this ethereal body does not have to eat or sleep;" "dresses are of different and beautiful colors and one can wear any color one chooses;" "some people write poetry." Mrs. de Koven gives a specimen of her dead sister's poetry, composed on the plane above and communicated to Mrs. Vernon, the medium, and then, in turn, by her to Mrs. de Koven:

Rippling streamlets play,
Here are sunbeams bright and gay;
Those who love are here together,
Never menaced by the weather.

If this is the poetry of a mature mind, inspired by what is witnessed in a higher spirit-world, we are both surprised and amused.

The dead sister of Mrs. de Koven makes these additional revelations: "People here create things as they want them;" "they have weaving machines;" "among the inhabitants there are no solemn or religious people;" "there is merriment and happiness and light-heartedness;" "people are superlatively happy;" "we here try to make people happy;" "the air is filled with happy expectancy."

Now, the more one studies these reported revelations made through the medium of Mrs. de Koven the more is one convinced that they are largely, if not entirely, subjective, and are just about what an educated, refined, imaginative and world-loving woman like Mrs. de Koven would think and write. If she would leave out her sister and her father and mother, Mrs. Vernon and the Black Hawk Canadian Indian, we would say that she has produced a very clever but purely imaginary picture of the life beyond, to which, however, the spirits of the dead through a medium have contributed neither a thought nor a single sentence.

Another book, published in 1920, is by Mrs. Wright Sewall, entitled *Neither Dead Nor Sleeping*. The author has the reputation of being an exceptionally gifted woman and has stood high in educational and social circles. In reform work she has gained an international reputation. She was left in widowhood to battle with the world as best she could, and until recently the entire subject of spiritism had been to her, as she expressed her feelings, "abhorrent." But in the brief space of three days her investigations resulted in her conversion. Since then she has had no doubts, and at present is a pronounced advocate of medium spiritism. The following are some of her confessions and some of the remarkable but absurd revelations that have been made to her:

I have seen, talked with, and received both letters, and paintings of flowers, from all those nearest to me who had at that time experienced what we call death, as well as from ancestors direct and collateral and from some other friends nearer to me in time than the latter, but more remote in kinship. My husband, my father, my mother my half sister, two sisters-in-law, a great grandfather, and a little niece, had identified themselves unmistakably and undisputably.

As a result of overwork, Mrs. Sewall became broken in health. But her deceased husband communicated with her and introduced her to a dead priest, Pere Conde. He assured Mrs. Sewall that he would restore her to perfect health if she would follow his directions. She also was introduced to another spirit, who was a personal friend of the priest, a no less personage than the famous pianist, Anton Rubinstein. It was arranged that he should co-operate with the priest, and by the study of music Mrs. Sewall's psychic faculties would be developed. After this had been done she became her own medium, and in the words of a reviewer, "the most striking instructions and messages were received through her own hand or heard by her clairaudiently. Besides, there is her own clairvoyance, and the many 'tests' given her to prove their authenticity."

As would be expected, Mrs. Sewall's health under the directions of the spirit of Pere Conde was perfectly restored. Through his assistance she also secured profitable lecture engagements, was introduced to different persons of distinction, who also rendered assistance, and subsequently the dead priest, who had been of such signal service, appeared to her in person. Such is Mrs. Sewall's declaration of her remarkable experiences.

Now, whatever construction is placed upon these revelations, one thing seems assured: that this woman in all she says appears to be perfectly sincere. If one should say that hers is simply a case of hallucination, the question remains, what caused this peculiar and very remarkable hallucination?

But before going further into this case we call attention to another recent publication entitled, *Man Is a Spirit*, written by Arthur Hill. This book describes the experiences of a medium who had attracted considerable attention from having disclosed, through spirit agencies, the location of the buried ruins of Glastonbury. The following are the statements of this medium:

A week after my father's funeral I was writing a business letter when something seemed to inter-

vene between my hand and the motor centres of my brain, and the hand wrote at an amazing rate a letter, signed by my father's signature and purporting to come from him. I was upset, and my right side and arm became cold and numb. For a year afterward these letters came frequently, and always at unexpected times. I never knew what they contained until I examined them with a magnifying glass; they were microscopic. And they contained a vast amount of matter with which it was impossible for me to be acquainted.

Unknown to me my mother, who was staying some 60 miles away, lost her pet dog, which my father had given her. The same night I had a letter from him condoling with her and stating that the dog was with him. "All things which love us and are necessary to our happiness in the world are with us here." A most sacred secret, known to no one but my father and mother concerning a matter which occurred years before I was born, was afterward told me in the script, with the comment: "Tell your mother this, and she will know that it is I, your father who am writing." My mother had been unable to accept the possibility up to now, but when I told her this she collapsed and fainted. From that moment the letters became her greatest comfort, for they were lovers during the 40 years of their married life and his death almost broke her heart.

As for myself, I am convinced that my father, in his original personality, still exists, as if he were still in his study with the door shut. He is no more dead than he would be were he living in America.

I have compared the diction and vocabulary of these letters with those employed in my own handwriting—I am not unknown as a magazine contributor—and I find no points of similarity between the two.

There is no need of quoting from other spiritistic publications; these before us are sufficient for our present purpose. And now the question that confronts us is this: What can be said in explanation of these several affirmations made by Sir Oliver Lodge, Basil King, the English lady of "high standing," Anna de Koven, May Wright Sewall and Arthur Hill? These persons and many others appear to have not the slightest doubt as to the authenticity and credibility of the communications they have received.

And what shall be said of the beliefs of the many distinguished and learned persons of different professions who have been careful investigators of spiritism and who have gathered evidence sufficient to convince them that there is something in spiritism that is supernatural?

In answering these questions we may employ the interrogative method.

1. May not some of these people have been self-deceived? Self-deception, as everyone knows, is one of the frailties of our mental

machinery. An intense desire to have a thing thus or so often results in a belief that it is thus or so. "Men see through their wills."

2. Is it not possible that others of these people are victims of paranoia, mental aberration or are of an unbalanced mind? These forms of insanity may come upon one suddenly or may not be noticed for several months after the victim becomes enthralled in spiritism. It is now pretty generally conceded that the atmosphere of spiritism is an atmosphere of insanity. While one should not say that all medium spiritists are victims of paranoia, yet multitudes of them are. There are contributing agencies that are leading to mental and other disorders. The nerve-racking rush that characterizes modern civilization produces such mental conditions that insanity is quite likely to follow any such spooky and weird manifestations as those presented by medium spiritism. And the remark is not much out of place that if affairs are not steadied down the world in two or three centuries will become a lunatic asylum.

And what adds to this dismal outlook is the fact that while no one can doubt that the last century has surpassed all others in mechanical achievements, yet on the other hand perfect sanity, intellectual brilliancy and physical perfection are in the retrospect and not in prospect.

And we are sure that there is no brain specialist in Europe or America who will not say that medium spiritism is giving its hand to make things worse and has no other tendency than to increase the mental disorders of the human race.

Dr. A. Maxwell Williamson, medical officer of health for the city of Edinburgh, has published the following statement in a Scottish newspaper:

The overwhelming majority of those who dabble in spiritualism are neurotic. Those who suffer from these practices are really on the same plane as victims of shell shock.

Unless spiritualism is checked it will mean social suicide. We must put our heel on this contamination; this thing will breed weaklings. It is unchristian, unscientific, and from a national point of view its spread means mental and physical deterioration. Its adherents are in the main abnormal and nervous.

A recent statement of Dr. A. T. Schofield, a prominent London physician, is this: that 100,000 cases of insanity in Great Britain have been caused by spiritism. We are told

by physicians that many patients in our institutions for mental disorders received their first mental shock in spiritualistic seances. The progress of the disease is, first, illusion, then emotional interest, then a mild form of neurosis, then delusion, hallucination, then nervous breakdown, an unbalanced mind, and finally an asylum with its padded cell. This point calls for no argument, for anything that has a tendency to produce insanity should have no encouragement, especially in the United States, where mental disorders are increasing more rapidly than in any other country in the world, and where the cost of maintaining asylums for the insane is more than \$20,000,000 annually.

Let the thing alone is, therefore, not only the Bible command, but psycho-therapeutics also utters its most solemn warning.

3. May it not be possible that the supposed communications and revelations from the spirit world are often nothing of the kind but are the product of a subconscious self that is not recognized as such at the time, but is thought to be a spirit from the invisible world. It is not wide of the mark to say that every man has a double consciousness and is to some extent a Mr. Hyde and a Dr. Jekyll. The Apostle Paul hints at this thought in his letter to the Romans: "For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate that I do." There are several other passages in the context that point in the direction of a consciousness that is capable of playing the most surprising and even astounding tricks upon the unsuspecting victims of medium spiritism. Rom. 7:15-23.

4. May not some of these spiritists and mentally unbalanced people be either the willing or the unwilling, or the unconscious dupes of professional mediums? The deceit and wickedness of spirit mediums would be incredible had they not frequently been exposed. Mediums have been successful in deceiving the very elect of the literary, scientific and religious world. These tricks are often performed with a cunning that few people can detect, and when mediums look wise and mysterious and say they are aided by pre-Adamic men and women, or some other outlanders, it is not surprising that bewildered people do not know what to think, and that bewilderment gives way at length to an unquestioned belief in spiritism and the medium is master of the situation.

5. In some instances may not these people have been dealing, not with the spirits of the dead but with demons who may have power and permission to personate the dead? The subject of Satanism in another section will be

examined in the light of Bible revelation and subjected to the test of psycho-analysis.

NOTE—This is the second of a series of articles on "The Riddle of Spiritism," by Dr. Townsend. The first appeared in the January number. The third will appear in the March issue.

Is Orthodoxy Afraid of Scholarship?

By W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania



N a recent volume entitled *Reasonable Religion*, Professor George Jackson of Didsbury College, Manchester, England, quotes from that interesting book, *Letters to His Friends* by Forbes Robertson, the following.

"I have been reading out here two very different kinds of books. One is Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, the other Moody's *Life*, by his son. Wellhausen's book gives you in outline the position of modern advanced criticism of the Old Testament. I have never before studied the history from the critical point of view really seriously. The study has proved extraordinarily interesting, and I must say that in the main I agree thoroughly with Wellhausen's position . . . Moody's *Life* stirs me up to realize more the worth of the individual, the surpassing value of man's moral and spiritual nature."

Dr. Jackson's comment on this is:

"Wellhausen and Moody—that is a very suggestive collocation, and it is not too much to say that the power of the pulpit in the days that lie immediately ahead of us will depend in no small degree on our success in yoking together the forces respectively represented by the German scholar and the American evangelist. To have the scholar and the evangelist forever working at cross purposes is to sterilize all the Church's best endeavor. The evangelist who is afraid of scholarship has only a maimed Gospel, which will only commend itself to maimed men. Scholarship without an evangel is as futile as the wheeling of swallows round the church steeple."

The conclusions expressed in the last two sentences are, of course, absolutely true, but everything depends on what is to be understood as scholarship. It will not escape notice that Dr. Jackson quietly assumes that Wellhausen represents presumably the only scholarship. Like Forbes Robertson, he believes that Wellhausen's position is true, but there are many to whom, on grounds of pure scholarship, it is untrue and impossible.

Thus, the heart of Wellhausen's theory of the Old Testament is what is known as the Central Sanctuary, meaning that the appointment of Jerusalem as the place of worship was

first made in the reign of Josiah, and only firmly fixed after the Exile through the Priests' Code (as Criticism calls it). But Baxter's *Sanctuary and Sacrifice* has not been answered by Wellhausen or any of his English followers, though it has been before the world for about twenty years. Another point in the critical theory associated with Wellhausen is the view that monotheism only dates from the time of Amos, in the eighth century B.C. Yet that fine and scholarly book by the late Professor Robertson, *The Early Religion of Israel*, has remained virtually unnoticed and certainly unanswered by the critical school for thirty years. Meanwhile, monotheism has been put back to the time of Moses, a thousand years earlier than Amos, by Dr. Burney, and this view elicited from the late Dr. James Hastings the following significant comment:

"If the Decalogue can be shown to come from Moses, or from the age of Moses, the present critical position on the early religion of Israel will have to be abandoned."

(*Expository Times*, vol. xix, p. 43:).

Further, Wellhausen was compelled through the researches of Wiener and Dahse to admit that the relation of the Text of the Septuagint to the Hebrew Text was a "sore point" in connection with his theory, but, so far as I know, he never faced it. Indeed, Dr. Witton Davies, a pupil of Wellhausen, has told us that Wellhausen never read a book on the side opposed to his own for the last forty years of his life. Dr. Jackson seems to be following the same line, for it is asserted in the current number of *The Bible League Quarterly*, that he declined to read that scholarly work, *The Unity of the Pentateuch*, by the Rev. A. H. Finn, on the ground that the question discussed in that volume has been finally settled for him. This does not strike one as expressive of the true scholarly position, and it is difficult to harmonize with some words in a recent article by Professor Jackson that "the first duty of a thinker is to keep his mind open at both ends."

Other scholars like Konig, Moller, Naville and Orr have challenged Wellhausen's position on grounds of history and scholarship, and I will hazard the opinion that if Forbes Robertson had lived until now, in view of his openness of mind and earnestness of spirit, he would not have felt so sure that Wellhausen was right. No doubt the critical view of the Old Testament is "extraordinarily interesting," but it is extraordinarily impossible to all who are not dominated by a scholarship which in turn is dominated by the evolutionary hypothesis.

This last remark brings to me what is the fatal weakness of the Wellhausen view. It is universally known that this scholar did not accept the supernatural, and it was on the basis of pure Naturalism that he dissected the Old Testament. How is it possible to separate his premises, based on a purely natural evolution, from his historical and religious conclusions? Many of his English followers, like Dr. Jackson, endeavor to harmonize the Naturalism of their Master with their own Evangelical faith, but this is really impossible, and Wellhausen himself once remarked that while he regarded the Old Testament as untrustworthy, he did not, as some of the British scholars, make God a party to it. In regard to the Old Testament account of the Tabernacle, Feasts and Offerings, he maintains that they never existed, and that their authors knew this. A further proof of the essential Naturalism of Wellhausen is the significant fact that in his later years he turned his attention to the New Testament and applied the same principles to that, with the result that in his works on St. Matthew and St. Luke he commences at chapter three in each case, without a word of explanation. But the Virgin Birth is not to be so easily disposed of as this, while the mere fact of this treatment shows the very opposite of the scientific scholarly attitude. And in his book on St. John's Gospel, Wellhausen's picture of Christ is substantially that of the Unitarian. Can anyone be at all surprised that the conclusions on the Old Testament of such a biassed man should be regarded with suspicion by those who believe that God has spoken to the world in His Son?

This is the Leader of those who take the critical view of the Old Testament, and with whose position Dr. Jackson and Forbes Robertson agree.

But I will go further and make bold to say that the acceptance of the critical view of

the Old Testament can hardly help affecting the general view of the New Testament. I know, of course, that there are a few men who, like Bishop Gore, endeavor to limit their criticism to the Old Testament and keep the New Testament practically immune, but the effort is futile, as is proved from Bishop Gore's own books. The mind refuses to be bound in this way and to exercise freedom with the Old Testament is inevitably to seek the same liberty with the New. Men like Kirsopp Lake and Forbes Jackson are only showing the logical outcome of Old Testament criticism, for it is absolutely impossible to keep the New Testament sacrosanct, as readers of Bishop Gore's "*Belief in God*" well know.

In support of my contention that a man's attitude on the Old Testament often affects his position on the New, I will adduce a witness in Dr. Jackson himself. In *The Hilbert Journal* for last July there is an article by him on "What do we mean by the Holy Spirit?" Here are some of the opening words:

"If we turn to the text-books of theology their writing concerning the Holy Spirit is unsatisfying. One has the feeling—I speak for myself at least—that the writers are toying with words, that they are making distinctions which are meaningless because they represent no reality that our minds can comprehend. It may be true, as the Athanasian Creed has it: 'The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.' All I can say is that I can find nothing either in Scripture or in experience to tell me what the words mean. And so it has come to pass that between the jargon of the 'Holiness Convention' on the one hand, and the elaborate mystifications of the theologian on the other, the average man in our churches has well-nigh ceased to think or care about the subject at all. 'Daddy,' said a little girl of my acquaintance, 'I can understand what you mean by the Father and the Son, but I haven't any use of the Holy Ghost.' And there in the refreshing frankness of a little child's speech the thoughts of many hearts are revealed. I confess frankly that, in the earlier years of my ministry, few incidents in the New Testament perplexed me more than the story of Pentecost; on no one day in the year did I find it so hard to preach as on Whit-Sunday. Of course, one could repeat the accepted commonplace, but there was nothing vital in them, they rang hollow and unreal; and so, for the most part, I did what so many do—I took refuge in silence and passed by on the other side. I think now that I know what to say when Whitsuntide comes around; the story of Pentecost is no longer a stone of stumbling."

In the course of the discussion Dr. Jackson expresses the opinion that there is nothing in the New Testament to indicate that there was "a fixed and definite doctrine of the Holy

Spirit in the minds of the writers," and he goes on to say:

"It would seem that we should best give intelligibility and reality to our thinking, and best serve the interests of our religious life, if we make no attempt to distinguish between the Holy Spirit and the living Christ, and learn to think of 'the presence of the Spirit' as but another way of indicating the Spiritual presence of Christ . . . whatever nice distinctions the theology of a later day might draw, in the experience of the first disciples the presence of the Spirit had no other meaning than the presence of the living Christ Himself! . . . to try sharply to distinguish between them is only to loose ourselves in that unreality which has been the bane of so much of man's thinking about God. . . It is by the way of practical identification that we shall most adequately interpret the experience of Christian men, whether in the first days or in our own, and that we shall best deliver ourselves from that web of unreal words which vulgar and learned alike have in the past so often woven about our feet."

In support of this position he quotes Dr. Marcus Dods: "I doubt if we can make much of a personal Spirit interposed between Christ and us." Then come these words:

"But it may be asked what becomes of our Trinitarian theology? Is not this identification of the Son and of the Spirit a move in the direction of the old Sabellian heresy? To which, perhaps, it might be replied, as Canon Streeter says, 'popular Christianity is Tritheism with reservations,' and that, if one had to choose, he might with good reason prefer the way of the ancient Sabellian to that of the modern Tritheist. But I am not a theologian, and it is not with the high mysteries of Trinitarian doctrine that I am here concerned. I am only attempting the much humbler task of seeking to interpret, in terms level with our own experience, what lies behind the non-theological language of the writers of the New Testament, and I believe we shall best understand it when in all that they tell us concerning the Holy Spirit's activities, guiding, teaching, and inspiring men, we learn to read their own vivid, unbroken consciousness of their Lord's presence with them."

Now what is this but essentially equivalent to the ancient Sabellianism? Another question on this subject may be given:

"It is not, of course, suggested that all the Apostle's (Paul's) language concerning the Holy Spirit, and still less all that is said elsewhere in the New Testament can be brought within this formula of identification. If there are many passages, like those which have been quoted, in which no difference is discoverable between the Holy Spirit and the living Christ, there are others in which with equal clearness a distinction is made. Elsewhere, as was indeed to be expected, the writer appears to be moving on the lower plane of Old Testament conceptions of the Spirit. So that it seems impossible to find any formula into which we can fit all our New Testament records of the manifold and varied activities of the Divine Spirit."

From all this I maintain that Dr. Jackson's critical position has seriously affected his entire view of the Bible. What do these extracts mean but that there are two views of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament which are incapable of being harmonized? And if so, what is the precise value of the New Testament as part of the revelation of God's truth? And what is to be said of either the truth or the taste of this?

"Little groups within the Christian Church have fastened on a few familiar New Testament phrases—the *baptism of the Spirit*, *led by the Spirit*, *filled with the Spirit*, and so forth—and have made them into something like the watchwords and badges of a party. But when we ask what religious experience, what spiritual reality of any kind, lies behind the words that are so freely bandied about, we are often at a loss to answer. There is, perhaps, no subject concerning which people have so chloroformed their minds with words as this."

It is clear that when a man begins to take as the basis of religion, his own intellectual opinion or even his spiritual experience, and substitute either for the revelation of God, without paying regard to the actual facts of the Bible, there is scarcely any limit to his departure from the truth of Scripture.

In conclusion I would say that so far from Evangelism being afraid of scholarship, it welcomes all true learning which is based on the belief in the supernatural. But for a scholarship, such as is represented by Wellhausen, it has nothing but indifference, not to say contempt, because it is spiritually sterile, and has no evangelistic power. In conversation with a representative Christian worker when I was in England last summer, a man who has travelled widely throughout the world, he expressed the strong opinion that Higher Criticism is nowhere characterized by soul-winning, and all that I have been enabled to notice confirms this view. Evangelistic and Evangelical orthodoxy is not only not in the least afraid of scholarship, but does not hesitate to challenge the character and power of a scholarship which is based on naturalistic premises, dominated by a theory of evolution in history which practically, if not actually, sets aside any Divine interpretation, and, as in the case of Wellhausen, finds no place for the supernatural. This type of scholarship, to put it mildly, cannot adequately and accurately explain the phenomena of Scripture. It is too partial to be sufficient, and too subjective to be satisfying. The scholarship that answers by spiritual results, let it be true.

The Greatest Thing that Is---Personality

By Professor^{*} L. S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

What Is Personality?



AN we define personality? Of course, we cannot define it adequately; nor, for that matter, can we adequately define anything. Try to define matter. Also make an effort to define mind. All we can do in the way of definition is to describe a thing by some of its outstanding qualities. It is only in this sense that we can define personality.

Perhaps the best definition we can give of a person is this: Any being who can say I. Then personality—the abstract term—would be that quality or power of a being by virtue of which he is able to say I. Of course, we must further explain that the person must be able to know what he is talking about when he says I; that is, he must not merely be able to say I like a parrot which has been taught to say it, but does not know what it means. So perhaps the central point or focus in personality is the *ego* which knows itself. The outstanding phenomenon, therefore, of personality is self-consciousness, which implies the ability to say I intelligently. A self-conscious being is a person, and a person is a self-conscious being.

It must be added, however, that the normal functioning of other mental powers is necessary to give personality its full right and play. If any part of the mind's powers are darkened or deranged, the *ego* might remain, but its normal functioning would be interfered with to a greater or less degree. In this essay we shall discuss the normal person, and shall not venture into the realm of abnormal psychology. Because some people are crazy, is no reason for believing that all of us are crazy.

What a wonderful thing is egoity—the power of the *ego* to cognize itself! How can a thing know itself? How can the "I" set itself out before itself, and, as it were, look at itself? How can an entity make itself its own object? How can it be subject and object at the same time? Well, we do not know; it is an insoluble mystery; but so is cognition; so is emotion; so is volition. Huxley's great enigma was simple sense-perception, which he could not solve and which he thought never could be solved. Herbert Spencer's riddle was the freedom of the will, which he was unable to think through. However, let us not stumble

and trouble ourselves over the mystery of self-consciousness; let us rather thank God that He has thus created us in His own image, and endued us with this wonderful faculty. It is by virtue of our self-awareness and our general awareness that we are rational beings capable of something greater and finer and nobler than mere automatic action.

How wonderful, too, and how blessed is the fact that the *ego* perdures through all our checkered life! Since our childhood many changes have taken place in our bodies. According to the scientists, there may not be an atom in our bodies that we possessed in our youth. How many mutations have taken place in our minds, too! We have added much to our stores of knowledge; our opinions of many things have changed; our emotions regarding many things have altered. Our environments may be totally different from what they were many years ago. Change! change! how much change! But one thing has perdured through all the changes up to the present moment—the "I," the *ego*. *You* are still *you*; *I* am still *I*. We know that we are the same persons we were when in our childhood days we played by the meadow brook and listened to the trilling of the song-sparrows. A mystery, do you say? Yes; but how thankful we should be that amid all the mutations, our identity has not been lost; we are still the same self-conscious personalities!

By virtue of this power of self-consciousness, with all that it implies and includes, we believe that we are justified in saying that the greatest thing that exists is personality. You may think of all else in the universe and in infinity, and you will find that all of it in real worth falls below the level of self-conscious being. Try to think of something finer, higher, nobler, worthier than a personal being. You can think of plenty of things that are lower in the scale, but if you try to think of something greater qualitatively, your thought vapors off into nebulousity and final vacuity. The greatest thing in the world is not love, but the *lover*, the person endued with the power and disposition to love.

The Ultimate Reality a Person

Now, in view of the transcendent character of personality, let us go back to the ground

and source of all being—to the Ultimate Reality. There must be such an absolute Reality, because, since there is something now, there must have always been something. If there ever was a time when there was nothing, there never could have been anything. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, is an epigram that lies at the basis of all thought. It is one of those axioms that no one would think of disputing. Now what must that Ultimate Reality be? Here we may think on a low plane or a high plane, as we will. To think on a low plane would be to say that the final quiddity is mere material substance, that matter is eternal, always has been, and is the ground and source and end of all things. But mere impersonal matter is not a very high kind of reality. If it is the only reality, the only entity, then we human beings, with all our powers, hopes and aspirations, are only the product of moving, developing matter—mere momentary bubbles on the surface of material things.

But we can think of something greater qualitatively than mere material substance; something of a finer mold and a higher genus: we can think of an Ultimate Personality; a Being who has mind, self-consciousness, emotion, volition. If love is so great a quality, as all will admit, we know that impersonal matter cannot love; but a person can love; therefore a person is greater than impersonal substance.

So when we are trying to go back to the Ultimate Being, why think in the lowest terms possible? Why not think in the highest? You and I surely are not constituted to be mere groundlings, as Shakespeare puts it. We feel that we are more than of the earth, earthy. And if we do think in the highest terms of which we are capable, we must go back to an eternal, absolute, perfect Personality, the Uncaused Cause of all contingent and finite things. That means a personal God. I want to ask any frank and honest person whether that is not the highest conception we can form of the Ultimate Being—a Person who knows, feels and wills; who loves His universe and cares with special tenderness and affection for His sentient and rational creatures. Suppose I am not able to prove by logical praxis that such a Being exists; is it not best, after all, to think of the eternal Reality in the highest and most inspiring terms? When we need not, why should "we grovel here below?" I am no utilitarian in ethics; in fact, as an ethical system I despise mere utilitarianism; but I cannot help believ-

ing that men's best well-being even in this world would be conserved if all people believed *ex animo* in a personal God who knows them, who loves them, who is displeased with their sins, but who wants to deliver them from their sins, and bring them into everlasting happy fellowship with Himself,—in short, the God who is depicted in such bright and living colors in the Bible.

So I say the greatest thing that *is*, is the Ultimate Personality—God. He is greater than the physical universe, immense as it is, for He created it and is its Sovereign.

There are persons who try to hold that God is super-personal, by which they think they mean something of a still higher order than personality. Herbert Spencer advanced this view, and therefore called the final reality the "inscrutable power" back of all things. He was unwilling to go further than to call it "that inscrutable power." Let me ask you in all seriousness, is a thing that you can call only a "power" something finer and higher in quality than a person? Ah! the trouble with Spencer was that he dealt so constantly with material things that he could think only in terms of materiality. Paul Carus—the Monist advocate of Chicago—also upholds the conception that God is super-personal, and thinks that this is honoring God. But is a God who is unconscious a higher being than one who is conscious? Surely not. More than that, what kind of a being is one who is super-personal? Can you form a clear conception of a super-personal being? No! Here again thought vapors off into mist and finally into vacancy. It is not the theistic thinker who is an obscurantist; it is the non-theistic thinker.

Again, you and I and the rest of our human kin are persons. If there is not a self-conscious and personal God back of and in the universe, how came we into existence? Can the non-personal evolve into the personal merely by resident forces? Can the non-sentient evolve into the sentient? Can the unconscious evolve into the conscious? Can the non-moral evolve into the moral? Can the non-spiritual evolve into the spiritual? Can an effect be greater and finer than its cause? Can the greater come from the lesser? Nay, nay, such theories violate the fundamental law of causality, which is that every effect and event must have an adequate cause. We conclude therefore that, if the greatest thing we know anything about in this world is a person,

then the greatest thing that we can know anything about back of the world is also a Person.

The Values of Human Personalities

Let us next note the *paramount value* of human personalities. In this connection I desire to say frankly that I think the Biblical representation of man's origin and importance is the most winsome, appealing and uplifting that has ever been set forth. My soul swells with gratitude whenever I read in Holy Writ that God created the heavens and the earth—the primordial material; then He developed it until it was ready to sustain life; then He created the various species of vegetables; after that He created in their proper order the various types of insects, birds and animals until the earth was fitted for the habitat of a being of a higher genus; when all was ready, He created man in His own image (Gen. 1:27), and made him the crown of His handiwork; placed him at the head of all things, for whose blessedness God made all things. No wonder He told man that he should have dominion over all the other creatures He had made. Previously God had made a beautiful garden for man's residence. Yes, He started man in a garden, and thus gave him a fair chance; not in a jungle amid wild and ferocious beasts, himself as ferocious as they. We do not look to the *brute* for our interpretation of man; we look to God and His creative act. In the beginning God made man a complete person, with rational faculties, with sufficient intelligence to hold communion with his Creator and to understand the meaning of his environment. He also created him with free moral agency, with the power of choice between good and evil, which was not a defect, but a higher and nobler endowment. True, this power of choice placed upon man a great responsibility; but that very fact was the sign manual of his nobility of character.

The very fact, therefore, that God created man a personal, self-conscious, rational being in His own image, and placed him at the head of His creation, implies that such a person is of supreme importance in God's eyes. See what a far-reaching vision regarding man this view connotes. Here is no low, groundling conception of man. This view of man is especially ennobling if we believe that God created man *directly* in His own image as a rational personality. Observe: If God thus created man in His own image, then we can understand the high evaluation He places upon man; we can then believe that God

cares for him; that God is solicitous for his welfare; that, if man falls into sin and trouble, God will come to his rescue and try to save him. Then we can see why God would even send His only begotten Son into the world to reveal Himself more clearly, to live this human life, to set man an example and teach him how to live nobly, and then suffer and die to make atonement for man's sins. All this is perfectly simple and clear if God made man a rational person in His own image. God surely would have supreme concern for a being whom He had made a finite replica of Himself.

There are certain scientists who try to daunt us men with a sense of our littleness and insignificance, especially in view of the immensity of the material universe. They point out the fact that our earth, vast as it seems to us, is only a mote in the air compared with the rest of the universe. The sun is many times larger than the earth; so are some of the planets of the solar system; then there are stars on stars, many of them much larger than the sun; systems on systems. The Galaxy or Milky Way is simply a pathway of stars and suns across the sky. Man in comparison is so small that he amounts to little more than an insect flitting in the air for a moment, only to perish forever. Thus these men try to overwhelm us and make us shrivel up into nothingness in the presence of this vast material universe.*

What shall we say to these things? Shall we wilt up and slink away like whipped puppies? For our part, we refuse to be cowed in the presence of mere *physical* bigness. *Quantity* does not impress us as much as *quality*. Things may be very big and yet be of comparatively small worth. A boulder is much larger than a jewel, but not nearly so valuable. David was a small lad, but he amounted to a good deal more than the strapping, bragging giant, Goliath. So a person, who is a rational, self-conscious being, has no

*While I am reading the proof of this article, reports are coming of the meeting of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science, held in Cambridge, Mass., in December. One of the speakers declared that human beings are not as important as they think they are, but are "insignificant insects thrust here into a little speck, our earth, that exists only for an instant." Compare this low estimate of man by a leading evolutionist with Christ's view when He spoke of the angels of God rejoicing over *one* sinner that repents!

cause to feel intimidated in the face of a big bulk of unconscious matter.

Let me prove that you are of much higher and nobler essence than the whole physical cosmos, in spite of its immensity. You are a person; you have self-consciousness; you can say I: the universe cannot say I; it is not self-conscious; it has no personality. You know or cognize the universe; the universe is not able to cognize you. You have emotion; you can love, hope, aspire: the universe has no feeling. You can will; determine yourself; choose between two paths; yes, you can discern moral distinctions and choose between good and evil: the universe cannot choose; it is under the law of necessity; it is an automaton, a mere machine. Do you not see, therefore, how superior you are as a self-conscious personality to the whole physical cosmos? Mere bulk *per se* amounts to very little; if it does not exist to serve some higher purpose than itself, it is a *worthless thing*; a superfluity, and the bigger it is the more *vacuous* it is. On the other hand, sentiment, conscious, rational personality is something that is worth while in itself by virtue of its capacity for feeling, for joy and blessedness, for goodness and moral excellence. Oh, no! an immortal soul with such capacities need not feel appalled in the presence of mere material bigness and bulk.

Once a skeptic accosted a simple Christian in this way: "Since you believe in God as the Creator of all things, tell me why He made so vast a physical universe, and at the same time made man so small in comparison? Why did He make so much matter?" The Christian man was rather taken by surprise for a moment, but presently regained his wits and said: "Well, I can see no reason just now unless it was to show us how cheap *dirt* is!"

This is quite a smart answer, proving the Christian man rather apt at repartee; and it might do very well as a rebuke to people who can think only in materialistic terms. Still, it is not the best answer that can be given. The physical substance of the cosmos is not "cheap;" it is not mere "dirt." God made it, and pronounced it good. Therefore, every electron, atom and molecule, however infinitesimal, is good and beautiful and fulfills its function in the divine plan. Then why did God create so vast a physical universe? My answer is: Because He knew He was going to make man; make him a rational, self-knowing and emotional personality; yea, and make him immortal withal. Therefore, He made

for man so vast a universe for his eternal residence and delectation, his arena and stadium of activity for ever and ever. Eternity is a long time, and so man needs a vast realm to investigate and enjoy.

The teaching which tries to minimize the value of the individual man, and overwhelm him with a feeling of insignificance and worthlessness is immoral; it has a tendency to breed contempt for ourselves and others; to create pessimism and cynicism; to cause men to under-rate human life; hence to destroy love, good will and respect among men; and all this put together will in the end spell the destruction of our civilization and the final annihilation of the race. On the other hand, if every man appreciates to the full his own worth, he will look upon all other rational personalities as of equal value, and therefore will work for their welfare as well as for his own. This is true Christian altruism—to love our neighbor as ourself, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us.

How this View Banishes Pride

Says some one: "Will not this exalted conception of man's worth, especially in his own eyes, tend to beget pride and egotism? Would it not be better for man to feel his littleness in the midst of spacial immensity?"

Our reply is, No. According to the view here advocated, every man must say, "By the grace of God I am what I am." Man did not create nor develop his personality. It is not something he won by his own efforts. It is a divine bestowment, not a human achievement. God gave man his personality by an act of divine creation. Therefore there is no room for vainglory, but only for devout thankfulness to God. Why should a man boast about his own achievements when he has nothing but what was given to him by a good and beneficent Father? On the other hand, if men believe that they are of a low origin, and have worked their way up to personality by their own efforts and merits, they will be likely to become braggarts of the most offensive kind. This conception of man's origin and development is responsible for much of the unseemly boasting about the marvelous achievements of men today and for their seeming unwillingness to acknowledge any obligation to God. Many men today who boast of human progress have nothing to say about justification by faith in Christ or salvation by grace alone. This leads to the braggadocioal

temper. The other view, namely, that we are indebted to a good and gracious God for the very essence and constitution of our being, and likewise for our ability for self-development, will, we feel sure, have a tendency to eliminate pride and make us humble and grateful.

Perhaps some one will say, "But are we not sinners, and therefore unworthy in God's sight?" To this I reply, "We are most unworthy; we all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." But, mark you, while we are *unworthy*, we are not *worthless* in God's sight. That is a vital distinction; he who cannot mark time with that infinite difference is lost indeed. A diamond might be soiled by being dropped into a muddy, slimy gutter; it would be a diamond still, having the same intrinsic value; and if it could be rescued and cleansed and re-burnished, it would shine with its original luster and would be as valuable as ever to its owner; yea, it would be more valued because it had been lost and was found.

Let me illustrate. If you held in your hand a common pebble, worth nothing in the coin of the realm, and, as you walked along the road, it were to fall into a muddy puddle, you would not soil your hands and cuffs to rescue it, would you? But if you held a valuable watch or jewel in your hand, and should drop it into a mud-puddle, you would surely not stand on soiling your hands and cuffs to re-yourselves and feeling an interest in yourself; the other man is also a person; so you should know and feel that he is just as valuable as you are. Here is the correlation of true egoism and altruism.

I close with our Lord's appraisalment of man's supreme worth: "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? And not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God. . . Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows."

cover it. That is a parable. Here are you and I, rational beings, made in the divine image, precious diamonds in the sight of our Maker; therefore I do not wonder that, when we fell into sin, peril and misery, the Eternal Son of God thought it seemly and worth while to come down here into this mudhole of an old sinful world, take upon Himself our nature, and even soil His heavenly garments in order to rescue and save us, and restore us to the Father in our pristine beauty and brightness.

Might not this high evaluation of ourselves lead to selfishness? We think not. If you and I look upon ourselves as of such great value, we will certainly regard every other personality as of equal value. Would not that view promote social interest and good will? Would it not make for social solidarity? On the other hand, if you think that you amount to little or nothing, that you are little better than a mote or an insect in the air, you will be likely to have the same low estimate of your fellowmen. Why should you concern yourself about motes and insects? Here is where the teaching of the Bible proves its deep psychology and ethics and its fine practical sense. It says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as *thyself*." Christ exhibited the same insight in giving the Golden Rule to the world: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto *you*." You cannot help loving

Science and Immortality

By the Rev. G. L. Young, Newburyport, Massachusetts



IN the *North American Review* for October, 1922, pp. 423-534, there is an able article by Charles Kassel on "Immortality and the New Physics."

This article brings to us with new force the constantly recurring thought that we poor humans, scientists included, know nothing at all of final existences, nothing of the ultimate nature of matter or of the constitution of the universe.

Indeed, notwithstanding certain revolutionary modern discoveries, or perhaps additionally because of such discoveries, matter itself has

seemingly become even more mysterious, more than ever an unknown thing so far as concerns its ultimate essence or constitution. These new discoveries, as they have opened up new facts to feed upon, seem also to have opened up a still larger vista of the amazing unknown. We are reminded of the lines of H. K. White, written more than a century ago, though he used the word philosophy instead of science.

What does Philosophy impart to man
But undiscovered wonders?—Let her soar
Even to her prodest heights, to where she
caught

The soul of Newton and of Socrates,
 She but extends the scope of wild amaze
 And admiration. All her lessons end
 In wider views of God's unfathomed depths.

So much has matter become a seemingly unknown thing that faith in its stability, even in its permanency, seems to have been shaken. Thus Mr. Kassel quotes R. K. Duncan as saying that "matter has disappeared as a fundamental existence, or at any rate it is explained as a manifestation of electricity. Mass, a supposedly indestructible thing, has disappeared with matter, and comes into existence purely as negative electricity." And Mr. Kassel himself remarks: "So, then, matter has become a transitory thing" (p. 525).

But as matter thus "has disappeared" or at least withdrawn itself into the background, something else has been coming more conspicuously to the fore. This is, to be sure, a mere hypothetical something, *viz.*, the unseen and unknown ether. In the words of Mr. Kassel:

"It is to the ether, that unseen, all-permeating thing, that we are driven henceforth to feed our love for the fixed and the lasting. We are told that through some stress upon the ether, in all likelihood, matter was born, perhaps, as a mode of motion rising out of the mother element as an ice crystal emerges from the sea, yet of it and destined in the fulness of time to return to it. It is this ether, *which we have never beheld, which no instrument has ever explored, and which gives to our touch never a sign of its presence*, that becomes the fundamental reality" (p. 525; italics mine).

Now relative to this hypothetic ether, it may be said to have had a somewhat changeable experience in the history of human thought. In the ninth edition of *Ency. Brit.*, Professor J. Clark Maxwell referred to the invention of ethers for various needs and purposes "till all space had been filled three or four times over with ethers" (viii. 569). But settling down to the one ether that now pervades the scientific mind, if not the external universe, we discover it to have developed in human thought from a very thin and rarified medium, in comparison with which the lightest and most volatile gases were dense indeed, to a medium of a density almost, if not wholly, unimaginable.

In comparison therewith, our denser and heavier forms of matter are but as shadow to substance, as ghostly nebulousity to crude and palpable ponderosity. For scientists, in their profound reflections as to the nature of ether, have apparently made it out to be much denser

than any form of matter known to us, "a medium almost infinitely denser than lead" (Thomson), its density "immensely greater than any known substance" (Lodge). We wonder not that Mr. Kassel, who quotes the above scientists, refers to this ether as "this amazing speculation" (p. 527).

Mr. Kassel's article thus brings out the idea of an invisible or supersensual world from which the present world is somehow derived, and to which it is conceived as likely ultimately to return. This is a view, by the way, that half a century ago was broached and elaborated by the authors of *The Unseen Universe* (see p. 111 ff.) This world of ether, hypothetically potential of eternal possibilities, and taken in connection with certain modern discoveries in the realm of physics that reveal an immensity of energy formerly unperceived, is conceived of as having at least a feasible connection with the idea and possibility of an immortal existence. A leading obstacle in the way of any scientific thought of a future life (article, p. 523) being thus removed, a way is opened up for a scientific concept of future life with a form, a bodily form, commensurate with the needs of immortal being.

By the consideration, therefore, of facts of recent discovery in the physical realm, it is deemed that

"one is emboldened in the supposition that behind and within the material system with which we are familiar is a subtle and marvelous world from which the universe we know is fed and sustained." And abundant warrant is claimed "for the statement that the attitude of science toward the notion of a supersensual universe, or series of universes, interacting with the material fabric we know . . . has ceased to be the hostile or indifferent one it once was. On the contrary, it might almost seem that the theory of a universe of finer and infinitely more potent substance is almost ready to be announced by our scientific thinkers" (p. 533).

As a consequence of all this, Mr. Kassel presents, in conformity thereto, a view of conjectural immortality—to be quoted in full later on.

But simply to discover that there may possibly exist a world congruous with the assumption of immortality, a world that would furnish a fitting integument and environment for an immortal being,—this does in no way prove that there is existent any immortal being to fit into such world. Nor does it in any way prove that any being now mortal is in any way or at any time to receive the added

quality of immortality. In actual fact, the actual state of man, as to whether he is or is not immortal, is left exactly where it was before. No light whatsoever has been shed on this, which is, after all, the real question. When all is conceded concerning the supersensual world, yet there goes with it not one iota of evidence of the persistence of individual life after death nor of any future renewal of life if so be that death really kills. And as Mr. Kassel says, "in this domain of thought, as in no other, we distrust the processes of abstract reason. Scorning all assumptions, *we demand proof*," etc. (p. 523; italics mine). And so do *we*. And this not merely that "a supersensual world of organized life is possible," but proof is demanded that man is ever to live in such world even though said world were a proved reality.

And, inasmuch as immortality is coextensive with a future eternity, the only proof that we can possibly have must emanate from One whose existence comprehends eternity.

And here the mind can rest in nothing short of that which we are accustomed to comprehend in the term GOD.

Here, then, is our point of departure. Here the present writer confesses to faith in that old-fashioned school of thought which holds that "there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets" (Dan. 2:28), that God has actually given a revelation to man, that said revelation is preserved to us in the pages of that remarkable book called the Bible, and that the trustworthiness of said Bible as a divine revelation is provable beyond reasonable doubt. We therefore are among those who hold that man has, not a merely conjectural possibility of immortal existence, but a real hope of immortality as divinely revealed.

When the Biblical hope of immortality is rid of extraneous excrescences that have accumulated on it during the course of the ages, when the extra-biblical spiritistic and paganistic adjuncts and substitutions have been torn away from it, it then becomes exposed to us as a happy and holy immortality of those redeemed through Christ Jesus; and this, not as independent soul or unbodied spirit, but as man in all the essential and fundamental characteristics of bodily being—only lifted to a higher, finer and nobler state of being. This is seen to be the Biblical position from the following considerations.

1. The historically presented fact of the bodily nature of Christ in his post-resurrec-

tion state. "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having" (Lu. 24:39).

2. The Biblical teaching of his bodily ascension; and that, after his ascent into heaven, he still possessed a body, even "the body of his glory" (Phil. 3:21). Moreover, "the fullness of the Godhead" then dwelt in him "bodily" (or "in bodily fashion," Col. 2:9).

3. The Bible doctrine of the resurrection of the body. "Thy dead shall live; with my dead body shall they arise" (Isa. 26:19). For "if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. 8:11).

4. The Biblical teaching of final bodily transformation. In this promised coming "change," "what is mortal" is not to be eliminated, but to be "swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. 5:4). "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:53). At his descent from heaven the Lord Jesus "shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory" (Phil. 3:21).

Now all this is strictly bodily, as any candid mind will immediately perceive. Yet we have been informed (*ad nauseam*, I had almost said) that all this is too gross, too crude, or too unphilosophical or unscientific; that the physical body once fallen is virtually beyond even divine redemptive power; that instead we are to be "pure spirit" (whatever that may mean). Resurrection, therefore, and bodily transformation and glorification are not what they so plainly and really are in the Bible, *i.e.*, facts of the physical nature of man as that nature becomes subject to divine exaltation and glorification. Resurrection is no more what it is Biblically set forth as being, a reliving of the bodily man in full somatic selfhood, but it is some magical and mysterious escape of an imprisoned spirit from the confines of the flesh at the event of death; or it is some conjectural assumption of a postulated spiritual or astral body in the intermediate state; or it is the coming up of the shade from Sheol, the soul from Hades—and so on to the end of man's chapter of conjectural and contradictory substitutions for the Biblically taught bodily immortalization of redeemed man.

But physical immortalization has been deemed as not scientific. Surely that is a pity. And yet men of philosophical and scientific attainments and types of mind have frequently admitted the need of some form of physical organism as a necessary medium of communication with the external world, as a mode of personal expression and even of sensation and of personal consciousness.

Professor Kirsopp Lake, *e. g.*, in the Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality for 1922, states that "better understanding has brought with it the conviction that the continuance of sensation is impossible without physical structure" (*Immortality and the Modern Mind*, p. 8).

J. H. Leckie has said: "The notion of a mind without an organ of expression, of a soul without a local habitation, is a mere rational abstraction, and is unable to support itself by any appeal to imagination or to experience" (*The World to Come*, p. 80).

And Newman Smyth, in his learned little work on *Modern Belief in Immortality*, gave up many pages (35-57) to a discussion of the question of future embodiment.

And Mr. Kassel says that "Life, love and memory as mere idealizations apart from form the mind rejects; yet form to us means matter," etc. (p. 523).

Such things seem indicative that modern thinkers cannot rest content with the notion of a future life as pure mind or naked spirit. In so abstract and hazy a notion they seem to find no intellectual satisfaction. This may be so even when, as admitted by Lake and others, they yet deem the survival of physical structure to be extremely improbable.

And now we are going to state that, even as a physical structure, a real bodily organism, for those divinely immortalized, not even modern science has right any longer to object. For has not science made, or attempted, contributions to human knowledge that, to some extent, coincide with Biblical teaching on this line, or at least maintain a certain correspondence thereto? And here we turn again to Mr. Kassel and quote from his article, p. 527. He has already, as noted, cited some amazing things that science has deemed possible relative to the properties of a supersensual world of ether, as interpenetrating the sensual world and operative upon it and within it, and yet as a something that is dense beyond computation. So Mr. Kassel says that

"if we suppose
intelligence, with an organism answering in its

characteristics merely to the properties of the ether, we have a being conforming very nearly, if not quite, to the notion [that] the mystics had of the indwellers of the supersensual world. With bodies more dense than steel, though unamenable to earthly sight or touch, these creatures would see the fleshy forms [such as we now possess] as a shadowy garment, and matter at large, but as a film thinner than air which offered no bar to their passage, and, exempt from the laws of gravitation, which held prison-bound the frame of clay, they might levitate at will and with the swiftness of light transport themselves from planet to planet. From the sun's rays they could take no harm and even the chill of absolute zero would leave their bodies unscathed."

To be sure, like about everything connected with this ether, this is purely hypothetical. And to our way of thinking, it is most incongruous and improbable. Yet as a hypothetical deduction from ether as usually understood, it is doubtless perfectly legitimate. Yet to us, any such conception as the above shows a most remarkable and revolutionary change of concept—and of front. For spirit life, as formerly and indeed usually expatiated upon, stands at the very antipodes of this bold supposition. For such spirit life has usually been considered as either strictly immaterial or else to be of a very rarified and tenuous nature. This we illustrate from Virgil, as freely rendered by Conington:—

Thrice strove the son his sire to clasp;
Thrice the vain phantom mocked his grasp;
No vision of the drowsy night,
No airy current, half so light.

—Aeneid. Bk. vi.).

But now, in the place of this thin and shadowy phantom, we have the concept of a mode of being that seems completely the reverse of this, one that stands at the other swing of the pendulum. Instead of being a thinner and more sublimated form of existence, there is a density of body so great that in comparison therewith our present organism is but as a shadowy garment, something very thin indeed.

Now, as for ourselves, we certainly do not look for the glorified bodies of the redeemed in the City of God to be "more dense than steel." But if science can catch a glimpse of such a hypothetical creature as the one represented, then surely the sane middle ground between this and "pure spirit" can be looked upon no longer as unscientific or unphilosophical. Indeed, to those who are grounded upon the truth of God's revealed Word, it but serves to plant the feet even more firmly upon the bed-rock of Divine Truth relative to the certainty of redemption in bodily form. For

such bodily redemption appears thus as not only not unthinkable, but as strictly in conformity with the working of that one superintending Intelligence who employs all things, both seen and unseen, as the scene of his operations and as the plastic materials for the rearing of eternal creations at present unrealizable by us.

So we shall not surrender our divinely revealed "hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie" has promised (Tit. 1:2). Nor shall we surrender it as a real and tangible bodily life, though spiritualized and glorified. Like one of old, we still await "the redemption of *our body*." (Rom 8.23).

The Epistles to the Corinthians

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

I.



HE Church at Corinth was founded by the Apostle Paul on his second missionary tour (Acts xviii. 1-11; 1 Cor. iii. 6-10; 2 Cor. xii. 4), about A.D. 52, he being in Corinth a year and a half (Acts xviii. 11).

CORINTH

According to more or less legendary history, Corinth was founded by Sisyphus, the Æolian, 1350 B.C. Its isthmus position gave it great strategic importance, and through the centuries its possession was repeatedly fought for. It became the center of the Achean league against the Romans, and in revenge L. Mummius, the Roman general, utterly destroyed it, 146 B.C. For a whole century it continued in ruins, until Julius Cæsar rebuilt it, 46 B.C., and colonized it largely with freedmen and manumitted slaves, these being eligible to office. The low caste order of its citizens may account for the deplorable moral character of its civil and social life.

In Paul's time it was a place of some 400,000 inhabitants, and was the most wicked and corrupt city in the Orient, the temple of the goddess Aphrodite (the Greek name for Venus) there, being served by a thousand sacred courtesans; which fact alone—the conjoining of lust and religion—would be enough to account for its superlatively abominable character.

THE CHURCH AT CORINTH

The church would of course be affected by the moral, or rather immoral, atmosphere surrounding it. Paul had written them a letter, now lost (1 Cor. v. 9; 2 Cor. x. 10), to meet a special phase of sin there; and other distressing evils arose, such as divisions (i. 10-16); unchastity (v. 1-13); taking private quarrels before heathen magistrates (vi. 1-8); and dis-

orders in their religious services (xi. 1-29). The church wrote him a letter (1 Cor. vii. 1) now lost and a delegation had visited him (1 Cor. i. 11, xvi. 17) at Ephesus, to report the untoward condition of affairs, and to learn how to remedy it. It was to meet this situation that the epistle—largely corrective—was written which we now know as

The First Epistle to the Corinthians—8 Chelt

The Epistle, probably the third extant epistle of Paul's writings (1st and 2d Thessalonians having been written before, about A.D. 52 and 53), is reckoned to have been written from Ephesus about five years after the foundation of the church there, i.e. A.D. 57.

ANALYSIS

Key Principles to the Epistle

Personal principle—loyalty to Christ

Practical principle—refer all to Christ

1. Salutation i, 1-9.
2. Concerning Church Factions and Party Spirit—i. 10, 14, 21.
 1. Factions reported. i. 10-16.
 2. Christ alone the center of the Christian system.—i. 17-31.
 3. Loyalty to Christ and His Cross as the sum of divine wisdom, the true spirit. ii.
 4. Not human teachers, but to Christ and His truth, is loyalty due. iii.
 5. Faithfulness to Christ the standard of estimating servants of Christ. iv.
3. Concerning the Conduct of Church Members with respect to
 1. Licentiousness. v.
 2. Litigiousness. vi. 1-11.
 3. Personal purity. vi. 12-20.
 4. The marriage relation and the parties involved. vii.
4. Concerning Matters Ecclesiastical vii.xi.
 1. Eating meals offered to idols. viii.

2. The right of the ministry to be supported by the Church. ix.
3. The use and misuse of Christian liberty. x.
4. The deportment of women in church meetings. xi. 1-16.
5. The observance of the Lord's Supper. xi. 17-34.
5. Concerning Matters Spiritual. xii, xiv.
 1. The bestowal of spiritual gifts. xii. 1-7.
 2. The nature of the spiritual gifts. xii. 7-11.
 3. The mutual relation of the spiritual gifts. xii. 12-26.
 4. The employment of the spiritual gifts. xii. 27-31.
 5. The gift and offices of love. xiii.
 6. The edification of the Church the end of all gifts. xiv.
6. Concerning the Resurrection xv.
 1. Deniers refuted. xv. 1-11.
 2. Christ has risen and His people shall rise. xv. 12-34.
 3. The nature of the resurrection body. xv. 35-53.
 4. VICTORY! xv. 54-58.
7. Personalia xvi.
 1. As to the benefices. xvi. 1-4.
 2. Paul's personal movements. xvi. 5-9.
 3. Sundry farewell directions and greetings. xvi. 10-24.

II.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians

This Epistle was written some months after the First, A.D. 57 or 58, probably from Philippi. Paul, because of the riot at Ephesus occasioned by his preaching (Acts xix. 23-41), left this inland Asian city to go again over into Europe (Acts xx. 1), but stops at the seaport Troas (Acts xx. 6).

Solicitous about the reception and effect of his corrective First letter to Corinth, which had been sent thither by the hand of Titus, he anxiously awaits, at Troas, Titus' return (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13). Disappointed, he pushes on into Europe, and comes to the Macedonian city, Philippi. Probably here Titus meets him. His co-laborer's report fills his heart with the conflicting emotions of joy and sorrow; joy, because much of the evils had been corrected; sorrow, because an anti-Pauline party had openly attacked his personal character and apostolic authority. So another letter becomes necessary.

He writes this Second Epistle to commend the reformation wrought by his First Epistle, then to vindicate himself against the unjust accusations of Christian truth.

As to the accusations, he had been charged, as the Second Epistle shows, with fickleness (i. 15-20); self-laudation (iii. 1; v. 12; x. 8); unrightful assumption of authority (x. 14); with being a traitor to his country and an apostate from his faith (xi. 22); not being a true minister of Christ (x. 7; xi. 23); and putting himself on a level with the Apostles. This cut him to the quick. And he answers; and what an answer!

Here, more than anywhere else, is the Apostle's heart exposed to view. As has been well said: "Human weakness, spiritual strength, the deepest tenderness of affection, wounded feeling, sternness, irony, rebuke, impassioned self-vindication, a just self-respect, zeal for the welfare of the weak and the suffering, as well as for the progress of the Church of Christ, and for the spiritual advancement of its members, are all displayed by turns in the course of his appeal, and are bound together by the golden cord of an absolute self-renunciation dictated by love to God and man." It is to the fact that this Epistle is to so large an extent personal—emotional and not logical—that its unsystematic character is due; but the order of contents may be indicated by the following:

ANALYSIS

1. Personal and Ministerial. Chaps. I-VII.
 1. Salutation. i. 1, 2.
 2. Introduction. i. 3-14.
 3. Self-vindication against the charge of fickleness with respect to his promised visit, i. 15-24, and with respect to the case of the incestuous offender, ii. 1-13.
 4. Thanksgiving for what God had wrought by him. ii. 14-17.
 5. His ministry's credentials among them. iii. 1-3.
 6. The Old ministry and the New. iii. 4-18.
 7. His personal vindication completed, iv. 1-18.
 8. His reasons for hope and courage. v. 1-10.
 9. His motive. v. 11-15.
 10. It's foundation in Christ and His redeeming work. v. 16-21.
 11. How he carried on the gospel work of reconciliation. vi. 1-12.

12. The response that should be made. to such work. vi. 13—vii. 1.
13. Exhortation to cast aside suspicion and trust him. vii. 2-16.
2. Contributions for the Poor Saints in Jerusalem, or Benevolence Transmitted into Beneficence. Chaps. VIII., IX.
 1. The example of the Macedonian churches. viii. 1-5.
 2. Principles and methods of beneficence, viii. 6-24.
 3. Exhortation to liberality. ix. 1-15.
3. Paul's Vindication of his Apostolic Authority. Chaps. X, XII. 18.
 1. He proposes to overcome all opposition. x. 1-6.
 2. His authority derived from Christ, which he will use by letter or speech and so widely as may be needful. x. 7-18.
 3. Reply to accusers. xi. 1-17.
 4. The seal—his sufferings and work. xi. 18-33.
 5. The attestation of Visions and Revelations. xii. 1-6.
 6. The Thorn, and sustaining grace. xii. 7-10.
 7. His defense concluded. xii. 11-18.
4. Final Warnings, Salutations, and Benediction. Chaps. XII. 19; XXI.

William Cowper

Author of "There Is a Fountain Filled With Blood"

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado



OWPER has been regarded as "the most distinguished poet of the last half of the eighteenth century." But "poets" are not always the best hymn writers. While the poets are generally superior in elegance of expression, gracefulness in rhythm, melodic flow of language, something more is necessary for a *hymn*. A devotional element is indispensable. Cowper had both.

Says John Newton, an early English hymnist (1725-1807): "There is a style and manner suited to composition of Hymns, which may be more successfully, or at least more easily, attained by a versifier than by a poet. They should be Hymns, not Odes, if designed for public worship, and for the use of plain people. Perspicuity, simplicity and ease, should be chiefly attended to; and the imagery and coloring of poetry, if admitted at all, should be indulged very sparingly, and with great judgment." Yet sometimes Newton's own conduct of rhetorical figures, rhythmic grace and felicity of phrasing, were such as Cowper or any other poet might envy.

William Cowper was born Nov. 15, 1731, at Great Berkhamstead, Hertfordshire, England. His father was Rev. John Cowper, D.D., who had been chaplain to George II, and his grandfather was a judge, brother of the first Earl Cowper, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain. His mother, by four separ-

ate lines, was a descendant of Henry III. So he was of gentle blood.

He was of delicate frame, of exceedingly sensitive feeling, and seemed to have a strain of the uncanny spiritish, eerie. Apparently a greater misfortune could not have befallen him than the death of his almost idolized mother, when he was six years old and she thirty-four.

By the time he was thirty-two, this strain had developed into insanity. He attempted suicide. His friends placed him in the asylum of the accomplished Dr. Nathaniel Cotton. Here he was in awful agony for a time, supposing he had committed the unpardonable sin.

After eight months of judicious treatment, he was one day reading the Bible out in the garden, seeking almost hopelessly for texts which might bring relief to his distress. He came upon Romans iii. 24, 25, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." The effect of this passage was instantaneous and revolutionary.

He tells us the happy result: "Immediately I received strength to believe, and the full beams of the Sun of Righteousness shone upon me. I saw the sufficiency of the atonement

Christ had made, my pardon in His blood, and the completeness of His justification." Thus he emerged from the deep gloom of despair and horror into the light and liberty of the Gospel. His reason restored, and still remaining in seclusion, he began a devoted religious life.

After a year and a half at the asylum, he found a most desirable retreat in the home of Rev. Morley Unwin, rector of the church at Huntingdon. He writes to his friend, Joseph Hill, under date of Nov. 5, 1765: "I have entered into an agreement with the Rev. Mr. Unwin to lodge and board with him. The family are the most agreeable in the world. They live in a special good house and in a very genteel way. They are all exactly what I would wish them to be, and I know I shall be as happy with them as I can be on this side of the sun." And four months later he writes: "The lady in whose house I live is so excellent a person, and regards me with a friendship so truly Christian, that I could almost fancy my mother restored to me for all the friends I have lost and all my connections broken."

Upon the death of Rev. Mr. Unwin, who was killed by being thrown from his horse as he was going to church on Sunday morning, the Rev. John Newton, the highly esteemed incumbent of Olney, made a visit of condolence to the bereaved family. As the rectory must be vacated to make room for a successor, at Mr. Newton's suggestion the family removed to Olney, and there, for nineteen years—until Mr. Newton's removal to a London parish—he and Cowper were in most intimate contact. It is said, "They used to pass four days every week in each other's society, and were rarely for seven successive working-hours apart."

Newton had sagaciously discerned that the best medicine for Cowper's mental idiopathy was occupation, and so he induced him to engage with himself in producing evangelical hymns for the prayer-meetings—Newton, though a "churchman," was much inclined to evangelical methods—held, not in the church, but in "The Great House" of the Earl of Dartmouth. It is said that it was for the inauguration of these meetings in this mansion, Cowper wrote his first, well known and much used hymn, the initial stanza of which is:

"Jesus, where'er Thy people meet,
There they behold the mercy seat;
Where'er they seek Thee, Thou art found,
And every place is hallowed ground."

The two men wrought together, and the result was the Collection, which lies before me, of the famous "Olney Hymns," of which Cowper wrote 68, and Newton 280. Cowper's number would doubtless have been greater except for a return of his malady.

An analytic and detailed consideration of this Collection would be highly interesting, but space limitations forbid. Nor can we speak of his work as a world-recognized Poet, nor yet of his little-known (we do not understand why) but should be well-known "Letters"—compositions that for epistolary grace and charm are not surpassed by any letters the present writer has ever read. A critic pronounces them "the purest and most perfect specimen of familiar correspondence in the language."

And it would be interesting to speak of different ones of his hymns, the occasion of their writing—they have histories—testified effects, etc., etc., but necessity confines attention to a single hymn.

If the question were raised as to which is the most popular of Cowper's hymns, no doubt the verdict would be the one on Zechariah xiii. 1, "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness."

"There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Emmanuel's veins;
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

We are well aware of the criticisms that have been made upon it. An emasculated and purblind theology—a New Theology that has no gospel salvation in it—has presumed to pronounce it repulsive to a refined taste, objectionable and gross in concept and expression, failing to see that it is not the language of a literal prosaic statement, but is the utterance of impassioned feeling which naturally voices itself, poetically, in bold metaphor. The stigma that Modernism and modernistic sympathizers would attach to it—"the theology of the shambles"—would be laughably absurd if it were not so shockingly blasphemous.

Many are the touching incidents which testify of the power of this hymn in the conversion of sinners and the comfort of saints. As has been truly said, it is one of those elect songs which have gone forth into all the earth, speaking in all earth's tongues, uttering the language of Christian hearts, and linked forever with Christ's Universal Church. With

its memories of the cross and its anticipations of the crown, it has as often been the first song of the regenerate sinner as it has been the last prayer of the pilgrim on whose ears the murmur of the river comes up through the falling shadows, mingled with the sound of the "harpers harping with their harps."

The second stanza, as given by most hymn-books compilers nowadays, is:

"The dying thief rejoiced to see
That fountain in his day,
And there may I, though vile as he,
Wash all my sins away."

Of a numbr of collections at hand, only two give the second couplet as Cowper wrote it. At times he happily got out of the conditional subjunctive mood into the indicative and declarative mood, and spoke with an assurance that we all ought to have:

"And there *have* I, as vile as he,
Washed all my sins away."

"Hymn tinkering" is not to be commended, *i.e.* not much! If it should be thrown up at the present writer, that in an article in the January BIBLE CHAMPION, on the matchless "Rock of Ages," he instanced approvingly amendations and emendations for the decided betterment of that hymn, he would have to plead guilty to the charge. It is therefore with proper shamefacedness he suggests a change in this hymn, not in its text, but in its order. The last stanza is:

"Then in a nobler, sweeter song
I'll sing Thy power to save,
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave."

In public services I have frequently asked—though against my theoretic principles—a change in the order of the couplets of this stanza, a change which has usually—perhaps always—met with instant approval. As written it is anti climax, and, as sung, it generally ends in a not altogether pleasant evanishing diminuendo. Changing the order of the couplets—singing the last two lines first and then the first two lines following—the stanza becomes a climax, and the progress is from gentle, subdued hope, up through crescendo, to triumphant jubilation. Try it.

The Olney Collection has two additional stanzas which are—no doubt wisely—omitted from present day collections.

A man was brought to a hospital in Glasgow, Scotland, for an operation on his tongue. A nurse tells the story. In reply to his inquir-

ies concerning the future, the surgeon told him that he would probably be able to speak with sufficient plainness to make himself understood, but he would never sing again. A shadow came over his face, and he said if that were to be the result, he must have one more song before his tongue were touched. In the presence of the doctors and the nurses, he broke forth with the hymn:

"There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

Changing the first word of the last stanza to fit the situation, he concluded thus:

"Soon in a nobler, sweeter song,
I'll sing Thy power to save,
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave."

The chloroform was administered, and the operation was performed, but the man never recovered from the ordeal. His song proved to be his last on earth.

This hymnist's and poet's end came. He was apparently going out of life in the blackness of darkness and horror of despair which only such a malady as his could produce. A distinguished American clergyman, of wide experience and large observation, has said that he has known many of God's children to be at times in darkness, but he has never known God to put one of them to bed in the dark. We are told that at the last moment, in Cowper's case, a wonderful change came, and upon his dead face there remained a look of bright and beautiful and sudden surprise.

Gentle, timid, sainted Cowper! At evening time there was light! His lisping, stammering tongue lies silent in the grave; but in a nobler sweeter song, he sings Christ's power to save!

* * *

John Bacon (1740-1790), an English sculptor, directed, in his will, that a plain tablet should be placed over his grave at Tottenham Court Road chapel, with his name, date, and the following inscription, "What I was, as an artist, seemed to me of some importance while I lived; What I really was as a believer in Christ Jesus is the only thing of importance to me now."

"De truth ain't allus easy to git at," said Uncle Eben. A man kin sometimes say sumphin' in half a minute dat he can't explain in five years."

THE CLUB

Abraham Lincoln

By Edwin W. Caswell, D.D., Middletown, Delaware



JUST before the capture of Petersburg by General Grant, the United States Christian Commission issued a special call for delegates. Rev. Samuel Brown, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Herkimer, N. Y., who had served one term as a delegate, invited me to accompany him to Philadelphia, where we were to make application for the position. Mr. Brown was easily reappointed. I was rejected, partly because of my youth, I being then only 21 years of age, and also because of the great rush of delegates to the front at that time. I had taken the precaution to take with me a receipt, just received from the Treasurer of the Christian Commission, for \$200.00, the proceeds of a fair held in Ilion, N. Y., under the auspices of the Local Auxiliary, of which I was treasurer. The presentation of that receipt immediately gave me my commission. Rev. Mr. Brown and I joyously started on our trip to Baltimore, and thence down the Chesapeake to Fortress Monroe and to City Point, Va., arriving on Tuesday, April 4.

At that time, there were about 7,000 wounded soldiers at City Point, including about 3,000 Confederates. The tents containing the wounded, were arranged in rows, facing the street, each tent furnishing accommodation for about 20 soldiers, 10 on each side, with room to pass between the rows of cots in the centre. Our work among sick and wounded was to distribute the following articles: Shirts, drawers, socks, handkerchiefs, towels, bandages, lint, farina, corn starch, crackers, cordials, dried fruit, canned fruit, jellies and pickles, Jamaica ginger and condensed milk, Bibles for hospitals and Testaments to all soldiers. We were also to distribute books for gunboat libraries, hospital libraries, and weekly and monthly religious papers.

On Wednesday, April 5th, President Lincoln and party arrived at City Point, on the steamboat "River Queen." The President and company continued their journey by rail to Petersburg and Richmond, returning to City

Point on Saturday, April 8th. On this day, it was my never-to-be-forgotten privilege to study the face and to enjoy the society of Abraham Lincoln. I accompanied the President and his party while they briefly visited every hospital tent in City Point. The President walked through each tent, shaking hands with each soldier, as he passed by, while Mrs. Lincoln, Charles Sumner, Attorney-General Joshua Speed, the Marquis de Chambrun, and others of the company, slowly sauntered along the street between the tents. Many of the wounded had only just arrived from the battles around Petersburg, and from the running fight beyond, to Burkesville. There were nearly as many Confederate wounded as Union men. Mr. Lincoln made no distinction, grasping the hand of the Confederate as warmly as he did the hands of his own boys.

The President would often make a cheering remark in passing, especially to the boys in gray, saying, "The war is over now, boys, you will soon be home again. Cheer up—we're all Union men now." Suddenly, we came to a bed where a captain was dying. He was suffering from 11 wounds. Mr. Lincoln walked over to him, took him by the hand, and with other friends, formed a circle around him. Presently the dying man half opened his eyes; a faint smile passed over his lips. It was then that his pulse ceased beating.

It was a privilege to be with Abraham Lincoln during those afternoon hours, when he had laid aside the cares of state, forgotten the burdens of government, and poured out his great heart in sympathetic friendliness, in gentle tenderness upon the wounded, suffering spirits of noble soldier boys! That remarkable experience has ever been an inspiration in my life. I can see today, that tall, bent form, those lines of care, seaming the sun-browned face, those gray-brown eyes with oceans of love behind them, looking out from extended over-hanging eyebrows, surmounted by a wide, high forehead, furrowed with dark wrinkles, that expressive nose, those firm lips, all speaking to me of the greatness and goodness that wonderful face mirrored. At times,

a deep sadness was reflected from his countenance, that was indescribable, making one think that the merriment and illumination on his face was only momentary. The deeps of his being were sad. Often he had letters, warning him of coming assassination, while the whole Republic, in the throes of rebellion, had rested upon his bent shoulders, his burdened heart.

In the evening, the distinguished party re-embarked on the "River Queen" for Washington. We little imagined we should never see the face of the President again. All day Sunday they were steaming up the Potomac. The Marquis de Chambrun tells us that, for several hours, Mr. Lincoln read passages from Shakespeare to the company. When he read of Duncan's assassination and of Macbeth's becoming king, he remarked, "How true a description of the murderer that one was when, the dark deed achieved, its torturing perpetrator came to envy the sleep of his victim," and then Mr. Lincoln read over again the same scene, with greater emphasis. Perhaps he had some premonition of his own departure in a similar way.

On the day Abraham Lincoln was assassinated, Friday, April 14, he was cheerful, even to joyousness. The war was over, peace reigned, a great day of Thanksgiving was soon to be called. General Grant had just arrived from the front. Captain Robert Lincoln was, on that day, paying his father a visit, preparatory to returning to his studies. Driving out that evening, the President seemed so joyous that Mrs. Lincoln said, "I have seen you thus only once before; it was just before our dear Willie died." At 10.30 that evening the President was shot. Dying the next morning, Secretary Stanton eloquently remarked, "Now he belongs to the ages."

City Point did not learn of the tragedy till Sunday morning, April 16th. The effect upon the soldiers was indescribable. The thousands of wounded in the hospitals, mourned with an intensity enhanced by the memory of that great and loving face that had so recently shone upon them, like the countenance of an angel. While we could not at City Point take part in the funeral obsequies, the imposing ceremonies, the solemn procession, which exceeded anything of the kind ever seen in the world, we did feel the unspeakable horror, the undefinable agony, throbbing in millions of hearts. We drank from the cup of sorrow lifted to the lips of the nation. We expressed our grief and estimate of the worth

of the martyr President with the entire nation and world, in the emblems and inscriptions which we could not then behold, but which, in every great city, greeted the silent dead, such as, "There is a great spirit gone;" "With malice toward none, with charity for all;" "Goodnight; and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest!" "Four millions of bondmen he liberty gave;" "George Washington, the Father, Abraham Lincoln the Saviour of his country!" "The nation's heart was struck, April 15, 1865;" "Honored in life, remembered in death;" "God's noblest work, an honest man;" "The assassin's stroke but makes the fraternal bond the stronger."

That was one long funeral week which followed Sunday, April 16th. The world felt with the poet, "In sorrowing tears, the nation's grief is spent. Mankind has lost a friend and we a President."

President Lincoln, just before going to Ford's Opera House, on that fatal Friday evening, said to his wife, "Mary, I need rest; I am so very weary. I know what we will do after this administration is over—we will go abroad. I would like to travel through Europe and I have a desire to visit the Holy Land, and especially would like to tread the same ground where Jesus trod. I would like to walk the streets of Jerusalem." These are said to be Mr. Lincoln's last words. But he could not wait for the closing of his second presidential term; he journeyed on that night to Jerusalem, the Golden, where the Emancipator of a race looked upon the face of the Emancipator of a world; our Lincoln giving freedom to the bodies of men, our Christ giving liberty to souls immortal. Each had their Calvary on Friday, dying for men.

Our matchless martyr is the prince of travellers now among all worlds, under the divine government of Christ's kingdom, which is for the people and with the people of God's universal family.

Mr. Lincoln, though not a member of any Christian church, was a man of prayer and a faithful follower of his Lord. He was more a man of prayer after the death of his boy Willie.

Mr. Lincoln said to a member of the Sanitary Commission, "Would you like to know how this institution was started?" "I certainly would," said Dr. Hill. "Well, one rainy night I could not sleep; the wounds of the soldiers and sailors distressed me; their pain pierced my heart. I asked God to show me how they could have better relief. After wrestling

some time in prayer, He put the plans of the Sanitary Commission in my mind, and they have been carried out pretty much as God gave them to me that night. Therefore, Dr.

Hill, you will thank our kind heavenly Father, and not myself, for the Sanitary Commission." Truly our martyred President was a man of prayer more than many people think.

Looking unto Jesus

By H. B. Hartzler, D.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania



HAT is a fixed center which never changes its relations to us or to anything, and he whose eye has once found Jesus and is fixed on Him has one sure, changeless, safe place upon which he can rely. The sailor who has once found beyond a doubt the fixed polar star, if he keeps his eye on it, need not fear that it will mislead him, but can settle his mind in confidence upon it and order his course accordingly. Now, everything around us is changeable, at all events in its relation to us, so that there is absolutely nothing so fixed and settled beyond a peradventure that a man may anchor his soul to it, save the Lord Jesus Christ. If we order our lives, if we steer our ship by this pole-star of the universe, we shall reach the harbor and avoid the shoals and rocks and have a safe and prosperous voyage. The pole-star will not change the facts in the life around us, the waves will toss beneath and around us all the same, the storm-clouds will sail across the sky, and the thunders roll about us all the same; this looking unto Jesus will not change any of the facts that exist, but it will keep us in the course, and that is the one main thing to be attended to in this life. Let a man get his eyes off from Jesus, how does he know in what direction he is going? Like the lost traveler he may think himself going straight ahead, when all the time he is proceeding in a circle.

Jesus himself when on earth, living on the earth for us, looked away from Himself unto the Father, just as you and I ought to do, and it is said in His Book that he looked beyond the life that lay between Him and the cross to the joy that lay beyond it, that was to finish His life work and consummate His struggle. The joy which is set before us is the Lord Himself and that which we receive in Him. No man can make a success in life who keeps looking down at his feet all the time. The poor wretch in Bunyan's inimitable allegory who stooped down with his muck-rake, the

bright crown about his head might shed its rays all around him, but he didn't look to see where the rays came from—he was occupied with the straws at his feet. There is nothing beneath us to kindle right and holy action, to develop what is noblest in man, it is all above us; the man who doesn't lift his eyes to Him will make a wretched, miserable botch of it; his whole life will be a failure. If a Christian man looks only at himself, he will become narrow, self-conceited, exclusive, prejudiced; the circle around him will constantly become narrower. No man can find in himself a well-spring of joy, any store sufficient for this life; but when a man looks away from himself, he sees one whose heart is as wide as humanity itself, who is entirely unselfish, and the broad heart of Jesus rebukes the selfishness of the man's spirit, makes him ashamed of himself and lifts him into a new sphere of activity. But he must look unto Jesus and not to his fellow man. A poor man may look away from himself to one who is rich, and if his vision end the canker of envy will eat his soul out of him; but when he looks to Jesus he will see one who, though rich, for our sakes became poor that we through his poverty might be rich. So if we look away from our own lives and look at men only we shall be shut within the limits of this little life, not seeing anything beyond it, and so become morbid and fearful. So, in order to get courage we must lift up our heads and look to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is just as true of us here as of Peter when he stepped out upon the waters of Galilee that fear will come, peril, paralysis of soul, and he who looks away from Jesus will as surely begin to sink. "Why are ye fearful," said He to His disciples, "O ye of little faith?" The question was answered in the asking. Little faith is a cause for fear, but if we go through life as seeing Him who is invisible, though He may seem to be asleep on a pillow we shall make life a success.

Here is a sinner; he looks at himself, as he ought to do, till he sees who he is, realizes his

sins and his desperate condition; if he continues to look at himself he will settle into despair; it is only as he looks away to Jesus that he can gain relief. If the bitten Israelites had spent their time looking at the people dying about them, or to the fiery serpents, they, too, would have died. It was when they looked up to the serpent of brass that they received the needed help.

There is no reserve force or power coiled up in the sinner that can save him; he must get it from without. "There is life for a look," not to the pulpit, the Bible, the closet merely, but "at the Crucified One." Let the convicted sinner look at others, either he will compare himself with those who are worse than himself, and settle down into self-righteousness, or, looking at those who are better, he will say, "I can never be as good as that man," and he will settle down into despair. Whether a man is saved or unsaved, let him look to Jesus; if unsaved, that will be the beginning of a new life to him, and his life from that moment will be full of joy, and peace, and comfort. Consider him in every way, just as a painter would sit in an old gallery at Rome and look at every line and lineament and shade of some grand old painting, until he should catch the inspiration of him who painted it,

and when he has it before his eyes, in his soul, and quivering down to his finger-tips, he takes his pencil and tries to transfer it to his own canvas. Here is the Christ face in four pictures, set in four golden frames—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John: here they hang on the four walls of that wonderful gallery; study them until you become ashamed of your own, until you long to imitate this wonderful model. Take another view, a quarter view, look at Him from every standpoint, ponder, study; if there is a defect in you, you will see it, as you will not when you look into your mirror—what is really a defect may seem a beauty-spot when you look into the glass. Let me look upon those peaceful faces that I may copy them, not upon canvas, but that I myself may be a copy of the Lord Jesus Christ. Gazing long into that patient face I see that I need a patience which must be filled from His fullness. Do I lack peace? Look into that face and it is untroubled. "My peace I give unto you." So, bringing us face to face with the Lord Jesus we are to be transformed, so that we are to be finally like Him. Looking unto Jesus is the secret of peace, of strength, of joy, of growth, of progress, of life. Let us look unto Jesus."

A Test for Critical Scholarship

By W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Germantown, Pennsylvania



It is often assumed and even said that the only scholarship worthy of the name is that associated with the Critical view of the Old Testament. A new opportunity of testing this idea has just appeared. It is well known that on the Wellhausen theory Ezekiel ch. 40-48 is, to use the phrase employed by Wellhausen himself, "The key of the Old Testament." According to this, Ezekiel is the link between Deuteronomy and the Priests' Code, and these chapters were intended to unite the two periods and prepare for the central sanctuary being in Jerusalem. To quote from a recent article to which I refer below:

"The supposition which gives life to the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is that the priests who influenced Ezekiel, the sponsors of Deuteronomy, and the priests who in turn were influenced by Ezekiel the authors of the Priestly Code, were so animated by the desire to secure the supremacy of their own sanctuary that they were prepared to adopt illegitimate measures to secure it."

But the argument so cogently set forth years ago by Dr. Baxter in "Sanctuary and Sacrifice" has received fresh and additional attention within the last few months. In *The Princeton Theological Review* for July and October, especially the latter, a writer, Dr. C. M. Mackay of Glasgow, points out that Ezekiel in these chapters was not thinking of Jerusalem but of another central sanctuary which could not possibly be identified with that in the capital. There are great differences in regard to the site, measurements and other circumstances which show the impossibility of interpreting Ezekiel ch. 40-48 of Jerusalem. Dr. Mackay then draws this conclusion:

"With Ezekiel no longer playing his part as the representative and transmitter of the centralization-at-Jerusalem impulse, the theory of the development of his ideas in a post-exilic Priestly Code is left in the air. [And so] the critical hypothesis which has dominated a generation of theological study, and which has had insidious results in quarters where the names of its authors


are unknown, is revealed as an absurd violation of commonsense. The man in the street will not be persuaded that priests of Jerusalem concocted, or doctored, the sacred books in their own interests."

As Baxter long ago said concerning Wellhausen, "if Ezekiel fails him, all is gone" (Sanctuary and Sacrifice, p. 228), because in his "History of Israel" Wellhausen says: "My

whole position is contained in my first chapter," dealing with the central sanctuary.

Is it too much to hope that Critical scholars who favor Wellhausen's view will give this matter their serious attention? Dr. Mackay's articles should be studied by all who are interested in this subject.

Believing in the Deity of Christ

 HERE was a time when, if a man said, "I believe in the divinity of Christ," it was meant by him and understood by those who heard him, that he believed Christ was Very God. The philosophizing of the past generation spoiled all this. There was a strong ambition to reduce religious thought to a natural basis. The common faith held Christ as supernatural. In order to reduce him to the natural, it was asserted that there was a divinity in every man. Christ differed from other men only in the measure of divinity in him. Christ was a man having the highest degree of divinity, and hence had the pre-eminence. This was the doctrine taught to the writer by his university professor in philosophy and ethics. This use of the word divinity led to the more exclusive word deity as signifying Very God. When a man said, "I believe in the divinity of Christ," it was often true that some would ask him, "But do you believe in his deity?" And frequently the same person who said he believed in the divinity of Christ would answer, No.

Later the word deity received the same treatment, so that now, when a man says he believes in the deity of Christ, it may mean he believes Christ is God, or it may be that he does not believe he is Very God.

A prominent so-called evangelical minister is reported to have said that he believed in the deity of Christ, because he believed in his perfect manhood, and to him a perfect man was deity. He claimed that Christ had attained to this perfection through his own development. He believed others might attain the same perfection, but he would give priority to Christ.

There is a school of professed thinkers who call themselves Ritschlians, who say Christ has the value of God, and therefore they profess belief in his deity. But they would be unwilling to say that he was very God.

Still another company say that in Christ they find the character of God, and through

that character God found them, and therefore they hold to his deity, and they quote the first verse of John's Gospel as expressing most nearly their view: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." This view is substantially Ritschlian. If you ask these men if they believe Christ was and is very God, they would either say no or elaborate their expression. None of those who hold these views would be willing to say, *Christ is very God*. There is something offensive about this form of thinking and statement. Christ is God, or he is not God. And it is not honest to parley, neither is there any gain in it. If a man ought ever to be frank, direct and candid, it is when he is expressing his belief and faith in God.—*The Presbyterian*.

* * *

A Bible Statement of Faith

By Rev. John Weaver Weddell, D.D.
Oberlin, Ohio

1. The Bible is *the* Word of God.
2. Jesus Christ is *the* Son of God.
3. The birth of Christ was supernatural.
4. The death of Christ was expiatory.
5. The life of Christ, at the right hand of the Throne, is mediatorial.
6. Christian life and character come down from above.
7. Humanity is God's special and new creation formed after the divine image.
8. Man is an actual and wilful sinner, fallen away from God and utterly lost.
9. Salvation from sin and death is by the atoning blood of Christ.
10. The new life is by regeneration and sanctification of the Holy Spirit.
11. The gospel is sent to redeem lost souls out of an evil world.
12. Our hope is in the kingdom of Christ in Christian hearts to-day and presently in all the earth.

THE SANCTUARY

Christian Growth

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado.

But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.—2 Peter iii. 18.



GROWTH denotes an increase of whatever the term is applied to. There are two methods of growth: one is by development, by an unfolding of an inward, vital principle; the other is by adding to from without. The first is natural, organic; the second is mechanical, inorganic. The difference between the two is the difference between the living and the not-living.

The two methods are illustrated in vegetation and crystallization.

Deposit a seed. Supplying the proper conditions, it germinates, and by a process belonging to its being, it takes into itself, assimilates, incorporates, these elements which become a part of itself; and thus an organism, a plant or a tree is built up, *i.e.* grows. This is growth by development, the unfolding of an inward vital principle. This is natural, organic.

Dissolve, now, some alum in hot water. Suspend in the solution a cotton cord, or a wire. As the heat which drove the alum particles apart, *i.e.* to say dissolved them, is dissipated and the liquid cools, of course the alum particles will come together again, and, in accordance with a law of their being, they will form along the cord or wire in octahedron crystals, *i.e.* crystals having eight equal sides; and the crystals increase as the particles are laid on from the outside. This is growth by accretion. This is mechanical, inorganic. In the plant there is life; in the crystal there is none. Living things grow by the first method; non-living things that grow, grow by the second method.

Suppose the attempt were made to change the methods, and produce a tree, for instance, by accretion. One might bring the body-wood, another the bark, another the branches, another the fresh foliage; skillfully and laboriously the parts might be put together, and lo! a tree beautiful to look upon! But the morrow's sun withers the leaves, the storm comes and blows asunder the lifeless parts, and the ground is strewn with the unsightly wreck of

that which had it been produced by the development of an inward vital principle, would have been the grace and glory of the landscape. Man cannot improve upon God's methods.

The Greek word translated "grace," *charis* is used in the New Testament 157 times. That it is a word of extensive meaning may be seen in the fact that in the Authorized Version it is translated by eleven different English words. But of the 157 times it is used, 130 times it is rendered "grace."

Charis, down at bottom, means favor. God's grace toward men is God's favor toward men. Then, in a secondary sense, grace is that which God's grace or favor effects. The first thing which God's grace effects in a Christian experimentally, is the impartation of a new nature, or life. Thus he becomes the subject of grace, has received grace, and this gracious impartation is to be manifested in what we call graces—graces of the Spirit—though the word *charis* is never used in the New Testament in the plural. It is the one grace of God from beginning to end.

When, then, we are bidden to "grow in grace," we are bidden to grow in that life, that nature, that being which by God's grace we received in becoming, and which constitutes us, Christians. And since the Christian life is, and proceeds from, an inward vital principle, it is to grow as living things grow and not as non-living things: grow by development instead of accretion.

We may now consider the *Means of Christian Growth*.

It was almost on my tongue's end to say *duty* of Christian growth. Duty implies something to be done by effort. But "which of you by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature" (Matt. vi. 27). Working to effect growth would be very much like producing our suppositious tree by accretion. And it is to be feared that very much of the thought concerning Christian growth is according to this false method. One says: "Now I must grow in grace"; and so he puts forth strenuous efforts to manifest this or that virtue, and

he hangs it adorningly upon the tree of his Christian life and contemplates with more or less of satisfaction the fruit he has produced. Have you ever seen, in a conservatory, mock oranges hung upon an orange tree to give the semblance of fruitfulness? Looked like real fruit, did they not? But that tree did not produce them. The orange tree produces its fruit in a different way. In the Christian life, doing duty is necessary; effort is indispensable; but neither is in place in the specific matter of growing. We gain no small advantage when we come to see this.

Says our Lord: "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not neither do they spin" (Matt. vi. 28). The lily makes no effort at growing. How then? The conditions of growth being supplied—soil, sun, moisture—it grows itself; the process goes on spontaneously, unconsciously, naturally. The life within takes out of the supplied conditions just what it needs for upbuilding, and, appropriating these, grows. Just so the living Christian thing within. Supply the conditions, growth takes place spontaneously, unconsciously, naturally. The law of spirit-growth and body-growth are one and the same.

So, when we are enjoined to "grow in grace", all we have to do is to supply the conditions on which growth depends, and growth will take care of itself. As to further effort, let that expend itself in doing the work which belongs to us as Christians to do in the place in which God has put us, and in advancing the interests of his cause in the world.

The supplying of the conditions of Christian growth is, therefore, of supreme importance. The human body is composed of at least 70 per cent. of water, and earths and gases form the remaining 30 per cent. Whatever constitutes our bodies, we have taken in from our surroundings. We are what we are because of what we have received. With imperfect supply, we are imperfectly nourished; the supply withheld, we pine, we die. Similarly as to our spiritual nature. What constitutes us as Christians resulting from growth, is what we have taken in from our Christian surroundings. The needs of Christian, being imperfectly supplied, we are imperfectly nourished; withheld, we pine, and coma may ensue.

What regard have you, hearer, paid to supplying the conditions of Christian growth? What watchful, provident, tender care environs the dear little babe that comes into your home! What regard is paid to the physical needs of the human being from birth all along

to old age and death! But candidly, now, should any less regard be paid to that within which is born of God? Under English law it is a misdemeanor punishable with five years penal servitude to abandon or expose an infant, or a child under two years, so as to endanger its life, or to inflict permanent injury, actual or probable, on its health. Ah, what crimes have been committed against the new born soul in abandoning or exposing it to vicissitudes which have endangered its life, or certainly have inflicted injury upon its health! Akin to that crime is the wrong which you, hearer, have done—if you are doing it—in failing to supply the conditions on which suitable Christian growth depends.

Now let us consider the *Conditions of Christian Growth*.

The first condition I name is *Food*. Says St. Peter, "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby" (1 Pet. ii. 2). How quickly is the infant put to the maternal breast! And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of "strong meat," or, as the Revision gives it, "solid food," for them that are of full age, adult (v. 14). The Word of God is the food of the soul for every one, from oldest to youngest. We cannot grow unless we feed upon it. What shall be said, then, of those professing Christians who seldom or infrequently read it, aye, who do not read it daily; yes, and meditate, ruminate, feed upon it? Would they be content with such physical feeding as they are with spiritual? And in the fifth chapter of Mark, where Christ miraculously raised the ruler's daughter from the dead, he instantly commanded that something should be given her "to eat" (v. 43). In the first Psalm we have pictured one who feeds on God's Word, meditates upon his law: "He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season: his leaf also shall not wither." Then, in supplying the conditions of Christian growth, we must duly give the soul the victuals and drink of God's Word; and we *should* give it its regular daily meals.

Another condition is *Wholesome Air*. Air plays a very important part in nature's processes. Those who are not instructed may think that vegetation gets its nourishment from the soil. This is true only in part, and in small part, too. Botanists say that plants live "principally on the air" (Gray, *School Botany*, 4446). And how much growth depends upon heat. Heat is produced by combustion, *i.e.* to say by the union of carbon and oxygen.

You point to the coal in your grate and say, "The heat is in that." Not until the atoms of carbon in the coal unite with the atoms of oxygen in the air can you get a particle of heat. Take away the air and combustion instantly ceases. So heat comes from the air as truly as from the coal. The natural heat of the body is produced by the union of the carbon supplied by the solids of the food eaten and the oxygen of the air that comes into your lungs by breathing, and into the capillaries. And the air, too, must be wholesome. There may be poison-laden breezes that will blast the plant, or that will be so noxious to human life as to produce disease, and maybe death.

A Christian's growth depends a great deal upon the atmosphere that surrounds him. One of the things that contributes greatly to a proper Christian atmosphere is prayer. As Montgomery puts it in one of his hymns,

"Prayer is the Christian's vital breath,
The Christian's native air."

He who does not pray cannot even maintain life as a Christian, much less grow. He, then, who would grow, must supply the condition of prayerfulness. One would think that every Christian would delight, as he should delight, in surrounding himself with this condition; not only private prayer, but family prayer, and public prayer in the week-evening meetings and in the sanctuary on the Sabbath day, and he who truly desires to grow, will do this. Those who are failing in this respect can see at a glance what their failure argues in regard to healthy growth, and even in regard to the existence in them of the Christian life itself. What are called "the means of grace" bear such relation to growth in grace that he who desires to grow will take to them by a natural affinity. And if you, hearer, find in your heart a choosing to forego the use of the means of grace, you should at once awake to the gravity of your symptoms; and if that choice has issued in corresponding act, there is indeed occasion for alarm.

The evil, sometimes seen, cannot be too strongly reprobated, of a professing Christian intermitting the use of the means of grace and disregarding his most solemn vows, because, forsooth, he has a pique against some other Christian, or possibly against the minister for his plain spokenness of truth. As though a man should starve himself, or girdle his trees, or break down his shrubbery, because his neighbor has done something he does not like! No growth there.

Then, too, a Christian's atmosphere is affected by his associations. It is a characteristic of every living thing that it gives forth exhalations. Every human being is contributing to the moral atmosphere around him, and that contribution will be favorable or unfavorable according to its character. Christians will, of course, give off exhalations favorable to Christian growth; hence the reason, for seeking Christian association. How can the companionship of un-Christian people be otherwise than unfavorable? And we know that the exhalations of some are positively poisonous to everything that comes within its baleful influence. Whatever the necessities of secular life may require, it is perfectly plain that no Christian can choose and find congenial companionship among immoral, profane, or bibulous people. Worldliness loads the air with moral malaria. I know a professor of religion who became so infected by the atmosphere of dance and the spiritual health so demoralized as to take away the appetite for the Lord's Supper, and the person stayed away from the communion table eleven years; and when with sore repentings there was a return, that sorrowful thing was stopped. Careful scrutiny should be exercised to see that associations be such as will contribute to make a wholesome air for Christian growth.

Still another condition is *Light*. We all know the importance of light to the plant. There is a peculiar property of the sun's rays that is absolutely essential to produce those chemical changes in vegetation which constitute growth. Only the light of the sun is competent, although I think it is now being found that artificial electric light has efficiency; but that does not count.

For Christian growth we must dwell in the light of the Sun of Righteousness. Says Christ, "Without Me ye can do nothing" (Jno. xv. 5). His rays will stimulate in us those subtle, unconscious processes which will enlarge our spiritual being; and like as a plant reaching up to the sunlight, grows by its inward yearning toward the light and by the light toward which it strains, so will we with inward yearning grow up toward Christ, lifting upward a stronger stock, spreading a broader leaf, opening into a more beautiful flower for more abundant fruitage that shall be to the praise of the glory of His grace.

These three conditions, Food, Wholesome Air, Light—and it is not pretended that these exhaust all the conditions—are indispensable to growth. They are, so to speak, passive con-

ditions. They may require some activity on our part to supply them, but supplied, we may be passive so far as growth is concerned, for that will go on of itself, naturally, unconsciously, just as the growth goes on in the uncoiling lily. And this growth in grace carries with it growth in what we call the "graces."

There should also be considered some of the *Evidences of Growth*.

The first evidence I name is Manifestation of Life, with strong emphasis on manifestation.

Travelers tell us that upon the Island of Malta there is a certain monastery, in one of whose chambers a person, upon entering, beholds a most thrilling sight. The walls of this room are of rock, and all around stand, or seem to stand, a row of monks, erect, silent, rigid. Their positions are those of the living. Their eyes seem to gleam in the darkness. But when one draws near and places his hand upon them, he recoils with horror. They are all corpses! The rock is said to have a peculiar preservative power, giving them something of the roundness and hue of life, and the secret of their attitude lies in an iron ring passing around the body and fastening it to the rock, holding each corpse erect against the wall.

Such seems a not inapt picture of not a few who profess and call themselves Christians. They are bound to the rock Christ Jesus, but only by the bands of creed, and ceremony, and ordinance. Apparently they are strong and upright in the faith; but they have no Christian activity, they manifest no life. Like the church in Sardis, they "have a name to live, but are dead." All the reputation they have for Christian character they get from the fact of their church connection. Now, this won't do. The manifested life distinguishes between the living and the dead. In the church there ought to be in every member this manifesting distinction. That one does not show any evidence of growth who does not *manifest* a Christian life.

Another evidence is an Increase in Christian Knowledge.

To St. Peter's bidding to "grow in grace," he adds, "and in the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." In the salutation at the very beginning of the Epistle, he says, "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord" (i. 2). At the end, as at the beginning and between, he sets great value on the knowledge of the person, office, and bene-

fits of Christ. And this knowledge is to be not only intellectual, but experimental. Growth in the grace of which Christ is the author, will have, keeping equal pace with it, an intellectual and experimental knowledge of which Christ is the object.

Other evidences are an increase of love; an increase of faith; a deeper feeling of humility; being more and more actuated by principle; increasing zeal for God's work. But these must be now passed by without comment.

It is hardly necessary to consider *Hindrances of Growth*, for attending to the conditions of growth named, there will be little trouble with hindrances. They can be disposed of as the farmers crops do the weeds,—by growth. When the corn is feeble and small the weeds are rank; but when it is large and spreads a dense shade over the ground, there is little trouble with weeds. Grow.

It may be fitting to have a final word on the *Possibilities of Growth*.

There is a touching story told of a sculptor who was found standing in front of his masterpiece, sunk in sad reverie; and when asked why he was so sad, he answered, "Because I am satisfied with it." "I have embodied," he would say, "all that I can think or feel. There it is. And because there is no discord between what I dream and what I can do, I feel that the limit of my growth is reached."

In Christian things we shall never reach a limit beyond which there can be no growth. Who would not be very sorry to have his Christian character judged by only what can be seen of it here? This sphere of life is not the place for the full development of that which God by his grace implants within us. Says St. John, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be" (1 Jno. iii. 2). To adapt the language of another, a man from the tropics may give to one in the temperate or frigid zones, the seed of some tropical plant which may, perhaps grow and put forth something of leaf, flower and fruit, yet which will scarcely be worthy to be called such compared with the broad, smooth foliage, the glowing brightness, the luscious product which the same seed would evolve in its native soil; so here God puts into our hearts an exotic seed—His grace—and we tend it; and, blessed be His name, it does grow beneath our cloudy skies and amidst our long winters; but when it shall be transplanted into the garden and courts of our God above (Ps. 92:13), it shall flourish with a beauty and luxuriance such as hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive.

FLASHLIGHTS

By Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D., Middletown, Delaware.

LEADERS FALL; GOD REIGNS

God said to Moses: "Thou shalt not go over into the promised land of Canaan." So the leader of Israel through forty years of wilderness life, ascended from Mount Nebo, and Joshua led the people to final victory. Divine leadership never changes. Transferring his legions from earthly to heavenly armies does not endanger the results of the conflict. God's truth ever marches on.

Those transferred to the front line of the River of Life are still battling with us in visible aeroplanes.

Abraham Lincoln, like Moses, had a view of the Promised Land of Re-United States of freedom and peace, but he ascended for wider visions and vaster usefulness. His shadow proved to be greater than his life. The entire American people were his pall-bearers, and all the world his mourners. His blood re cemented the North and the South into one indissoluble union; his death was a victory vaster than Appomattox. Do not the living fight better, remembering the heroes who have fallen?

Those fighting for liberty today are marching under the inspiration of the spirit of the great Emancipator. When Lincoln fell, he arose everywhere. All parties, races, countries, and peoples were brought nearer to each other in a great brotherhood of freedom by his sacrifice.

Millions of soldiers have gone the way of Moses and Lincoln from European battle-grounds. One moment here; the next, beyond the stars. Today, singing national songs as they approach the enemy; tomorrow with the choir invisible. They have found the paradise of peace and freedom while we are fighting on. Is it not one army of the living God, Here or Yonder, one Temple of Liberty, whose pillars rest on eternal foundations, one God over all? His government has no end; His eternal Republic is unshakable!

How noble to die with the full armor on, in the strength of youth and manhood, rather than by slow decline of age and feebleness, quickly promoted to the never-dying hosts of the skies. A French soldier expressed the true

view when he said, "I count myself as dead already; if I survive today's battle, tomorrow will give me another chance to die for God and France." A lamb being torn by a wolf has aroused anew the spirit of liberty throughout the world.

THE TEN VIRGINS

Railroads do not hang out the red light of warning when there is no danger. Neither does Christ. If there had been no need of watching, working and preparing, he "would have told you." The foolish virgins were not prepared for emergencies. They lost their chance by sleeping, by having no oil. If a general fails in the supreme crisis of a battle, it is as great a failure as if he were defeated in the beginning. A chain is no stronger than its weakest link. One only has as much grace as he can command in trial. Instead of saying, "Where is the promise of his coming?" we should heed the words, "Be ye also ready."

Be busy waiting and watching. Idly looking out of the windows for the return of your Lord when you should be at the post of duty is sinful. One might as well be asleep on the picket line as only gazing. "Wakeful work" should be our motto.

Lost opportunities. We are to seize time by the forelock, for he is bald behind. Neglecting time or killing time makes life a failure, and there is no bribing death to extend the privilege. Golden opportunities improved mean golden glories enjoyed. One may redeem time lost by buying up new opportunities with increased devotion.

The loving desire for the Bridegroom will make Christ first in everything. "Lovest thou me more than these?" More than ease, sleep, riches, honors and self? When you love his appearing with burning desire, you will watch as you work and wait, and be ready when you hear "Behold, he cometh!"

The shut door. "Too late" are awful words. Lost wealth may be recovered; wasted years never. You have but one period of youthful days; one manhood, one old age. Once you saw over the doorway of the great feast, "Whosoever will." "Him that cometh unto

, I will in no wise cast out." But then you
used to enter. You risked all and lost all.
The cry of the foolish virgins was first to
those who obeyed the Christ: "Give us of
your oil." The wise virgins were not stingy;
they could not give personal purity to an-
other. Character is not transferable. Next
they cry, "Lord, Lord, open unto us." The
answer came, "I know you not." Loving is
growing him. They had lost their first love,
had never loved at all. They had lived an
aimless, careless life, not openly sinful, but
neglectful of the warnings and promises of the
Son of God.

The second coming. The Bridegroom
could have his bride without spot or wrinkle,
flameless and holy, ready for the marriage
supper in the heavenly kingdom. The Reve-
lator saw this general assembly of the church
pass from rags to radiance, from dust to di-
vinity, from shadow to sunshine, from earth to
heaven.

All mankind is invited to this royal feast.
The Bridegroom calls; the Spirit and the
bride say come; angel voices echo the invita-
tions in sweet ministries; every golden mo-
ment is an open door for our entrance—will
you linger till too late?

ONE BY ONE

How many converts Christ made through
his sermons to the multitudes we do not know,
but we do know that some of his grandest
triumphs occurred while conversing with a
single individual. When he wanted a man
or his historian and biographer, he called
Matthew. One little sentence turned the
deed in a publican's life. Why did Matthew
follow him so quickly? It may be he saw the
quiet authority and majesty in Jesus' face and
heard the gentle kindness and sympathy in his
voice, as grace was poured from his lips. He
was charmed, fascinated, and left his count-
ing-desk for the mission of counting mercies,
honors and riches for all the ages.

Jesus sought men rather than masses. He
had interviews with outcasts, one by one. He
seemed in no hurry, though he had only three
years for his ministry. He could wait at the
well for the conversion of a woman who
could bring all the townspeople to hear him.
The first disciples followed his example.
Andrew brought his brother, Simon Peter, to
Jesus. On the same day, our Lord findeth
Philip and Philip findeth Nathaniel, and said,

"Come and see Jesus!" Nicodemus followed
Nathaniel and listened to a sermon recorded
in the third chapter of John's Gospel that has
filled the world with glory.

Just as atoms communicate the forces of
nature by touching each other until the whole
is electrified, so soul atoms touch each other
till a world of beings are thrilled with divine
power.

When our Lord wanted a missionary to the
Gentile world, he came personally to Paul,
called him, saved him, sent him, and he be-
came the greatest among the apostles. Win-
ning one is the way to win the race of man-
kind. We win men one at a time for the
sake of gold, honor, ambition and power, but
how few try to win a single individual for his
soul's sake and for the sake of our Lord!

SOUL WINDOWS

The face, the mirror of the soul, reveals the
inner personality—windows through which we
gaze upon each other, beholding character in
the reprint upon the face like the light of
stars, but it is only a reflection of the beauty
within that will shine on forever. We read
in the open book of the face unfathomable love
in the eye, grace in the portals of the lips, joy
or sorrow in tears, blushing delight in the
cheek, melody in the voice, a real manifesta-
tion of the being we love.

No canvas or marble can fully supply the
place of the living face. Artists have taxed
their genius to reproduce the face of the Son
of God, but they cannot paint the majesty of
His look when He said, "Let there be light!"
or the infinite tenderness of His love when He
whispered, "Come unto Me and I will give
you rest!"

Nature vies with art in her gallery of the
beautiful representations of His matchless be-
ing in stars and suns, in sea and mountain, in
sunsets and storms, in fields and forests; all
together are but a composite photograph of
His wisdom, power and majesty. How much
more we would have known if we could have
gazed upon His face and listened to His voice
when He said, "I am the light of the world,
the water of life; I am the vine, ye are the
branches." Consider the birds and the lilies,
how the Father cares for them. He spake and
looked as no other man ever did.

After two thousand years of Christ's shin-
ing, we see His face clearer than in the dim
light of David's day, but the Psalmist could

exclaim, "When Thou saidst, Seek ye my face, my heart said unto Thee, Thy face, Lord will I seek." How our souls often long for the faces we love! Jesus' face helps supply the place of faces at the Front, on the Marne, and of those gone over the last river—

"Whose angel faces smile. Which we have loved long since and lost awhile."

Ye are the light of the world—Matthew 5:14

Light, the first act of creation, is a revealer, a witness of all other creative glories. There was light because God was there. Every good and perfect gift cometh from the Father of light. We may become bright and shining lights after Him, reflecting His beauty to men like the sun and stars, till the whole earth is full of His glory.

When God's spiritual light is flashed upon the soul, we become responsible for the illumination of the world; to smother its shining means night to men. If we seek to shine our own light, we stand between God and men as shadows, and those seeking after God will cry as Diogenes did to Alexander, "Stand out of my sunshine."

It is the property of light to shine. We need only to let it shine, like the stars, without effort. Hiding the jewel rays in a napkin prevents our becoming a lighthouse to earth's mariners. We should be like John the Baptist drawing the curtains of darkness from the form of Christ, crying, "Behold the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sins of the world."

Cheerfulness is light; benevolence a pure ray, joy, winsome, love, bright and beautiful. We are to let these rays gleam forth upon the world that men may see the light of life so that at evening time it shall be light, and after the momentary eclipse of death, light forevermore.

**O taste and see that the Lord is good—
Psalm 34:8**

When one is anhungered, seeing others eat, live and thrive, he follows their example, becomes strengthened and satisfied. He knows then by experience that food is good for the body, essential to life. Opinions, arguments and statements do not feed the soul; sitting at the Lord's table, eating of the honey sweets of his love, we are filled with all the fullness of God. Therefore, experimental values are the only true tests.

We know that power was in electricity from creation's morning but we failed to know how to utilize it by making the connection. Grace and truth are in Christ, but men refuse to connect with the divine battery, choosing darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil.

We know that a grain of corn abideth alone until it is planted and dies; then all nature brings it to life in a golden harvest. It is dying to live, having nothing to possess as things. We are to taste and see, plant and know, do and live, get the inner light as witnesses. Thus we may verify the truth of God in the only way possible, having Christ in you, the hope of glory, the everlasting light of the soul. Grace and growth, love and logic, abide under the sane law; if we meet the conditions we will know the vast possibilities of the self-evidential facts of life in Christ.

**But now are they many members but one body—
1 Corinthians 12:20**

If the eye, the hand, the foot, suffers, the whole body feels the pain. If one member of the world's industries says to another, "I have no need of you," how soon disaster occurs. We may well say of Capital and Labor, "United we stand; divided we fall." Like the Siamese twins, when the vital connection was severed both perished; so employer and laborer, separated by warring factions, may destroy themselves and paralyze the world.

Every building speaks of an architect and laborer, a thinker and a toiler, the ideal and the real. What a contrast between union of effort and individual antagonism. Organization and harmonization are for the welfare of mankind. Loving thy neighbor as thyself is the bond of union, uniting all into one brotherhood. Put yourself in each other's place, seeing both sides of every great question; the wider vision will excite sympathetic feeling between all classes.

As the League of Nations is to save the world from the ravages of war, so a similar league between Capital and Labor will release the dove of peace, float the union flag of love for one another; quench the selfish burnings of capital, extinguish the violent fires of anarchy, making one glorious flame of undying devotion, brotherhood and friendship between all races, inaugurating a new democracy for the masses and the classes in the faith that unites and not in a fear that disintegrates.

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, A.B., B.D., Hay Springs, Nebraska

January speaks to us of the open door; and February is named after the purification necessary in order to enter most successfully into life's open possibilities. Man was not made to live alone, nor to live alone. Man's life can never be at its best unless united with God, through a pure and sincere faith.

Christ All in All

Colossians 1:1-23

Christ has all things in His gift. Satan claimed to have all earthly pomp and glory and offered it to Jesus in the wilderness. But all things earthly and heavenly rightfully belong to Christ, in Whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. "In Him all things consist."

What Jesus Christ is to us depends upon what we are to Him. He is nothing to the man that refuses even to look to Him. He is much to anyone that trusts in Him, even in a small degree, like the mustard seed. When we give Him our whole life, no matter whether that is small or great to begin with, when He becomes all in all. "I live, yet not I; but Christ lives in me."

Through Christ God's life comes into our being. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." We cannot know anything definite about God except through Jesus, Who re-livified Him, incarnated Him, and thus revealed Him to mankind. John the Baptist was the greatest man born of woman, but he was of the Old dispensation; and the least disciple of Christ is greater than John! Through the revelation of Christ, God was seen and felt to be the Father Almighty. Through the Christ-life in Mary Morrill the young Chinese soldier found the true God; and he has become the Christian General of China, the Governor of Shansi, the hope of China.

Through Christ we "are filled with the knowledge of His will." This is essential absolutely if we are to live a right life. God's will is the best possible life for us. Jesus rightly said, "My meat is to do the will of my Father." It is not law nor the customs of our fellowmen, nor the decree of autocrats in things material or ecclesiastical; but it is the will of God that is supreme, and the supreme good.

Thus through Christ we attain the "spiritual wisdom and understanding." This is

revealed unto "babes," though not understood even by the wisest in the world's wisdom. (Matt. 11:25). Spiritual wisdom will endure and will eventually triumph in our own individual life and in the earth, among the nations.

Through Christ we are "strengthened with all power." Get that? Can any Christian say he is weak? By such a confession he condemns himself for lack of faith. It is all sufficient, "according to the might of His glory."

Through Christ we have the assurance that we are His, and thank Him for "the inheritance of the saints in light," because we know He has "delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His Love." Hope becomes sure and steadfast. In this life we are "grounded" in God, and can walk worthily of the Lord, in worship and in service.

The Mind of Christ

Philippians 2:1-11

Christ has become in a most wonderful way "the Desire of all nations." Every sane person of Christian knowledge desires something of such a life. All true Christians yearn most of all to be like Christ and to do His will. The perplexing problem often is how we can know how to think and live and act to secure this life?

Jesus did not leave us many rules of life. This was wise on His part; for conditions alter the requirements of goodness. The best rules may be kept and yet the life may be rotten, as were the lives of many Pharisees. The supreme thing for us to know is the "mind of Christ." "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ."

The incidents in the Gospels are of great import; but they are secondary. What Jesus said and how He acted are interesting, but they may be only dead memories in our brain. The vital worth of the Gospel is the "mind of Christ," His disposition, His spirit, His attitude towards God and man. To know this

and to live it is life, that is life indeed, ever blessed.

The mission of Christ was to enable us to understand His spirit and to desire to live in that spirit. When He returned to the Father, He promised His Spirit in fulfillment of His Kingdom. He will lead us into all truth, and reveal to us day by day just what we ought to think and do. Through His spirit the mind of Christ moulds our life in every particular. The mind of Christ becomes the type to which our immortal nature conforms, involuntarily and by our sanctified volition. As Jesus incarnated the Father, so we incarnate Jesus.

"The Prince of the Host of Jehovah"

Joshua 5:10-15

Joshua was reconnoitring. He had sent spies. He had crossed the Jordan. He had encamped in Gilgal and set up the memorial of twelve stones. He had eaten of the old corn in the land. Now they must move forward against their human enemies. He looked towards Jericho, which must first be taken. He saw a man over against him with a sword drawn in his hand; and Joshua went unto him, and said, Art thou for us or for our adversaries? The man answered, "Nay, but as prince of the host of Jehovah am I now come."

This is a sample of Bible facts, true to life. The Bible is not puerile but virile. It gives us not fables but parables, not fiction but facts. Joshua is a worthy man, possibly with weaknesses, though undiscovered. He was a type of the divine Joshua, Jesus.

Joshua faced the Promised Land with its enemies; and you and I face life's possibilities with its problems. The challenge comes to us as it did to Joshua, a challenge to life and service. There are three steps to true character. We must be on God's side. We must be unafraid. We must do God's will absolutely.

Our life depends upon its attitude to God. Paper may be used to wipe the floor, or on it may be printed the Gospel of Christ. First of all we must give ourselves to God to be used by Him. "Step over the line!" In the lobby of the Hotel Martinique, Manhattan, N. Y., there is a clock made in 1611, still keeping good time. On its face is a figure of Matthew and the motto, "Fear God in time."

Joshua was brave. He and Caleb were the only two of the twelve spies sent up into the Promised Land from the south that were not afraid of the giants. Now before Jericho

he challenged an unknown person with drawn sword. We need moral courage, fight against gambling, bootlegging, profanity.

"What saith my Lord unto His servant? He was eager to do God's will. God made us capable of learning His will, by giving us something of His own life; and every provision has been made that we may know if we so desire it. Let us remember that God is behind His will; and all His resources are at our disposal, if we do His will. All our talents are so made that they may be charged with the electric power of God's Spirit. Petercock showed man's possibilities.

Joshua was reverent. God gave us Joshua these days.

A Magic Wand

Exodus 4:1-9

History has ever revealed the belief in witches and magic. The pagan peoples today are terrorized by their witch doctors. The Puritans had not thrown off the yoke of this bondage. There is a real magic, which we need not fear. Laughing at childish magic let us study the magic of God.

Every spring we glory in the magic of Nature. We often see the magic of the influence of one person upon another. We experience the magic of true knowledge, of thought, of effort, of love. The rod of Moses was a symbol.

The shepherd rod of Moses became a magic wand when God touched it with His power. It was not for fun. It was not for selfish purposes. It was to be used for God's glory, in the service of mankind. So our ordinary things may be made magical for good, through consecration to God.

This magic rod counteracted the curse of evil. Ulysses restored his companions, after they had been turned to swine by Circe. Liquor is a Circe; and we need the wand of God to bring men back to sanity. False propaganda is a Circe. So are prejudice, pride, slander. This rod did havoc among the hosts of Pharaoh. It has done the same in America against slavery, dueling, drinking, etc.

This wand worked wonders, at the Red Sea, at the dry rock, on the hilltop, where Joshua fought against Amalek. "This simple faith has made America great." Democracy is God's wand, but in Russia it became a serpent in the hands of Lenine. The Gospel is the magic wand of Christ. Our influence may be a magic wand.

Tracts for New Times

The Council of the Victoria Institute are now bringing out three more "Tracts for New Times," Nos. 7, 8 and 9 as there had been so satisfactory a demand for the previous six. These Tracts are all reprints from the Journal of "Transactions" of the Institute, and can be had from the publishers, Messrs. Morgan & Scott, 12, Paternoster Buildings, E.C. 4, or at the Office of the Victoria Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, London, S.W. 1, at 4d. each.

1.—"*The Problem of Nature*," by the Rev. G. F. Whidborne, M.A.

2.—"*Modern Conceptions of the Universe*," by G. F. C. Searle, Esq., M.A., F.R.S.

3.—"*The First Chapter of Genesis*," by E. Walter Maunder, Esq., F.R.A.S.

4.—"*Creation or Evolution*," by Walter Kidd, Esq., M.D.

5.—"*The Bearing of Archæological and Historical Research upon the New Testament*," by the Rev. Parke P. Flournoy, D.D.

6.—"*Indications of a Scheme in the Universe*," by the Rev. Canon Girdlestone, M.A.
"*Luminaries and Life, in connection with the Genesis Account of Creation*," by the Rev. A. Irving, D.Sc., B.A.

7.—"*Modern Unrest and the Bible*," by Sir Andrew Wingate, K.C.I.E.

8.—"*The Attitude of Science towards Miracles*," by Prof. H. Langhorne Orchard, M.A., B.Sc.

9.—"*The Old Testament and the Present State of Criticism*," by the Very Rev. H. Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

The First Object of the Institute is "To investigate, in a reverent spirit, important questions of Philosophy and Science, especially those bearing upon Holy Scripture." The "Objects" paper of the Institute and the Subjects of Papers for the present session can be had on application to the Honorary Secretary, **W. Hoste, 1, Central Buildings, London, S. W. 1, London, England.**

West!

Colorado California

A whole vacation empire of mountains, lakes, seashore, National Parks, Forest Preserves,—yours, at the

Lowest Fares in Years

Choice of routes; liberal stop-over privileges; and the luxurious

Rocky Mountain Limited

direct to either Denver or Colorado Springs.

Golden State Limited

to Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and through the scenic wonders of Carriso Gorge, the short line to San Diego.

Rock Island Lines

Mail the coupon and let us plan your Summer holiday journeying. Colorado book or California folder, both profusely illustrated, will be sent you without charge.

Comfort and Courtesy are your fellow travelers on the Rock Island.

Mr. L. M. ALLEN, Vice President
Rock Island Lines

751 La Salle Station, Chicago, Ill.
Please mail me without charge your
(California) book
(Colorado)

Check the books you desire

Take the **Sunset Route** to California Every mile a scene worth while

New Orleans San Antonio El Paso Tucson San Diego Los Angeles San Francisco

This is the open air route to California. Oil burning locomotives insure freedom from coal dust and cinders and permit open windows and the comfortable use of the observation car all the way across country from NEW ORLEANS to SAN FRANCISCO on the famous SUNSET LIMITED!

DAILY Through Tourist Sleeping Car between Washington, D. C., and San Francisco via New Orleans and the SUNSET LIMITED.

TRI-WEEKLY Sleeping Car Service between New Orleans and Globe via Bowie for the convenience of travelers desiring to make the wonderful 120-mile detour over the APACHE TRAIL HIGHWAY to ROOSEVELT DAM and Phoenix, where connection is made with daily through sleeping car operating between that point and Los Angeles. An additional charge of \$20.00 is made for the detour.

"TRI-WEEKLY Sleeping Car Service between New Orleans and San Diego via Niland, California, in connection with the San Diego & Arizona Railway. Passage through the CARRISO GORGE in California by daylight, makes available to transcontinental passengers one of the most awe-inspiring scenic wonders of the West.

For information and literature address.

F. T. Brooks, General Agent

SOUTHERN PACIFIC LINES

1602 Chestnut Street,
Philadelphia Pa.

'Phone Spruce 6577

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly. \$3 a year

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

Moses and the Monuments: Light from Archaeology on Pentateuchal Times.
Stone Lectures, 1919. 300 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid. (In press)

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. 325 pages. 8vo, cloth,
\$1.65, post paid.

The Problem of the Pentateuch. 300 pp. 8vo, cloth, \$2.15, postpaid.

HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50, postpaid.

The Coup de Grace to the Wellhausen Critics.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages, 8vo, 40 cents, postpaid.

A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics.

Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

The Wellhausen Critics in *extremis*.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

The Ice Age in North America, and Its Bearings Upon the Antiquity of Man. 6th Edition. 210 illustrations. 808 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$6.00, postpaid.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 3d Edition. 40 illustrations. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. Many illustrations. 550 pages. 12mo, cloth,
\$2.00, postpaid.

Story of My Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO., 6834 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

A Frank Talk on Hosiery

Try us on Hosiery—you will be pleased. Many write us our line beats anything they have ever tried. We put conscience into every order.

WE STAKE OUR REPUTATION ON OUR LINE OF HOSIERY

Our Hosiery will stand the acid test. Our new line is now complete. We know we can please you both in quality and price.

NOTE OUR FOUR GRADES MEN'S SOCKS

No. 70—Best Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, Lisle finish, all year round weight—a sock made to wear. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

6 pairs, \$1.25; 12 pairs, \$2.25, prepaid.

No. 75—All year round weight, Fine combed Cable-twisted Lisle Cotton, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, 200 needle—a Dressy, Durable Sock. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, 90c; 6 pairs, \$1.75; 12 pairs, \$3.00, prepaid.

Our No. 77 is a distinct Summer Hose—looks like silk but will outwear several pair of silk. Try a small order.

No. 77—At last we again offer this attractive Sock, made as it was made before the war—a perfect, semi-full fashion, seamed back, Tram Silk and Art mixed—the best combination silk made for wear—extra fine gauge; nothing more attractive at any price. Its wearing qualities will surprise you. Black and colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.25; 12 pairs, \$6.25, prepaid.

No. 80—Black with White Split Foot, Drop Heel that will not show when low shoes are worn, no seam across toe—specially recommended for Tender Feet. Greatest value we know of for all year round wear—we know of no hose to equal it. Only Black with White Soles. Sizes from 9 to 12.

3 pairs, \$1.25; 6 pairs, \$2.40; 12 pairs, \$4.50, prepaid.

LADIES' HOSE—THREE GRADES

No. 5—Select Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced Heel and Toe, Elastic Ribbed Garter Top, Fine Gauge, medium weight—a Reliable Hose, fully worth its cost. Black and White colors. Sizes 8½ to 10.

6 pairs, \$1.50; 12 pairs, \$2.75, prepaid.

Our No. 25 is a distinct Summer Hose—looks like silk but will outwear several pair of silk. Try a small order.

No. 25—Very attractive Ladies' High Grade Mercerized Lisle Hose. While having the appearance of Silk Hose one pair of No. 25 will outwear several pairs of Silk Hose. Has Front Drop Stitch for low shoe wear, strong Garter Top, Double Sole and Double Heel and Toe, Fine Gauge, Semi-Full Fashion, with Seam Back. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.25; 12 pairs, \$6.25, prepaid.

No. 60—Black Beauty—Possesses unusual wearing qualities, and has an unusually Elastic Garter Top, is Semi-Full Fashioned, made from carefully selected yarn, High Lustre Ribbed Hose, knit with Triple Thread Heel and Toe. Extraordinary value. Black only. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.15; 12 pairs, \$6.00, prepaid.

Sample Box Men's Socks, 8 pairs—2 each Nos. 70, 75, 77, 80—\$2.60.

Sample Box Ladies' Hose, 6 pairs—2 each Nos. 5, 25 and 60—\$2.50.

Important. Good Hosiery are often condemned because a size smaller than should be worn is ordered; always order fully large in size or foot.

If shipment is to be forwarded insured add 3c for any amount ordered below \$5.00; and 5c for any amount above \$5.00.

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., Reading, Pa.



YELLOWSTONE PARK

"A Wide Domain of Mysteries"

GO SEE IT! JUNE 20—SEPTEMBER 15

HOT SPRINGS of unexampled transparency; Hot Sulphur Springs—Hot Geyser Fountains—Hot Paint Pots—Canyons of Inspiration—Divine Sculpturing and Coloring—Waterfalls "bounding and resounding" like Southey's Lodore—Lakes and Trout Streams galore—Camps and Hotels that vie with the best—the greatest of all Auto Trips—Wild bears, elk, bison and deer unafraid, are some—some only, of the inscrutable wonders at **Yellowstone Park.**

Greatly Reduced Fares

IN EFFECT FOR 1922

To Yellowstone Park and North Pacific Coast Points

Northern Pacific all steel trains run direct to the original and natural entrance at GARDINER, whose Entrance Arch Theodore Roosevelt dedicated in 1903.

And across the ROCKIES and the CASCADE RANGE are PUGET SOUND, RAINIER PARK and the COLUMBIA RIVER regions.

If you cannot, in Western phrase, "rope" it all in—"corral" as much as you can.

Northern Pacific Agents Will Help You

A. B. Smith, Pass. Traffic Mgr., St. Paul, Minn.